This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AN,
ORT

TEENTH MEETING

nference

ristian Churches

23-26, 1901.

5, 6
7-9
10-20
21-47
51-67
71-213
214-235
236, 237
238-247
249-255
257-261

ONGRESS STREET

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NINETEENTH MEETING

OF

The National Conference

OF

Unitarian and Other Christian Churches

HELD AT

SARATOGA, N.Y., SEPT. 23–26, 1901

WITH

THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE CONFERENCE AND A LIST OF THE DELEGATES

BOSTON
GEO. H. ELLIS CO, PRINTERS, 272 CONGRESS STREET
1902

INDEX.

PAGE

ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL 7

SERMON: The Interpretation of Life. Rev. Charles E. St. John, 10

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS 21

President's Address 21

REPORTS:

Council. Rev. Howard N. Brown 51

Address of Rev. John P. Forbes 61

ESSAYS AND DISCUSSIONS:

A Century's Retrospect. Rev. Charles G. Ames 71

A Retrospect and Prospect. Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D. . . . 80

The Church at Work. Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce 86

The Church at Worship. Rev. William Milton Brundage, Ph.D. 96

The Church at Worship. Rev. Lewis G. Wilson 105

The Gospel for the Twentieth Century. Rev. M. J. Savage, D.D. 115

The Gospel for the Twentieth Century. Rev. James H. Ecob, D.D. 128

The Minister's Adjustment to the New Conditions. Rev. William C. Gannett 135

The Church and the Social Problem. Miss Jane Addams . 144

The Church and the Unchurched. Rev. Thomas R. Slicer . 154

The Relations of Sociology to Religion. Franklin H. Giddings 163

The Idea of the Church Historically Considered 175

The Church's Interest in Good Government. Frank Moss . 185

Discussion 189

The Organization of Labor. Rev. Edward Cummings . . . 192

Trusts, or the Centralization of Power. Prof. John B. Clark, 204

UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY:

The Child, the Church, and the Citizen. Rev. George Batchelor 214

PAGE

The Place of Imagination in Religious and Moral Education. Clara Bancroft Beatley 220

The Bible in the Twentieth Century. Rev. J. H. Crooker . 227

The Ideal Teacher. Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson 234

THE WOMEN'S ALLIANCE 236

UNITARIAN CHURCH TEMPERANCE SOCIETY 238

"What might have saved Jamie?" Rev. William C. Gannett, 240

The Significance of the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Rev. William L. Walsh 246

LIST OF DELEGATES 249

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS 257

Rules of the Committee on Fellowship 260

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

ORGANIZATION FOR 1901–1903.

President.

HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, LL.D., Washington, D.C.

Vice-Presidents.

HON. GEORGE E. ADAMS	Chicago, Ill.
HON. THOMAS J. MORRIS	Baltimore, Md.
HON. GEORGE C. PERKINS	San Francisco, Cal.
MR. J. HARSEN RHOADES	New York, N.Y.
HON. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	Boston, Mass.
HON. ROCKWOOD HOAR	Worcester, Mass.

General Secretary.

REV. D. W. MOREHOUSE, 104 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.

Treasurer.

MR. RICHARD C. HUMPHREYS, 272 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.

Council.

REV. THOMAS R. SLICER, *Chairman*	New York, N.Y.
REV. W. W. FENN	Cambridge, Mass.
REV. GEORGE BATCHELOR	Cambridge, Mass.
MR. FRANK N. HARTWELL	Louisville, Ky.
MR. CHARLES A. MURDOCK	San Francisco, Cal.
MRS. PAUL R. FROTHINGHAM	Boston, Mass.
MR. WILLIAM HOWELL REED	Boston, Mass.
REV. SAMUEL M. CROTHERS, D.D.	Cambridge, Mass.
MR. EDWARD C. ELIOT	St. Louis, Mo.
MISS EMMA C. LOW	New York, N.Y.
REV. D. W. MOREHOUSE, *Secretary*	New York, N.Y.
MR. RICHARD C. HUMPHREYS, *Treasurer*	Boston, Mass.

Committee on Fellowship.

New England States.

Rev. W. L. Chaffin	North Easton, Mass.
Rev. Austin S. Garver	Worcester, Mass.
Rev. Edward A. Horton	Boston, Mass.

Middle States.

Rev. D. W. Morehouse	New York, N.Y.
Rev. D. M. Wilson	New York, N.Y.
Rev. James T. Bixby, Ph.D.	Yonkers, N.Y.

Western States.

Rev. Franklin C. Southworth	Chicago, Ill.
Rev. Mary A. Safford	Des Moines, Ia.
Rev. Albert Lazenby	Chicago, Ill.

Southern States.

Rev. George A. Thayer	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Rev. C. A. Langston	Atlanta, Ga.
Rev. Marion Ham	Chattanooga, Tenn.

Pacific States.

Rev. George W. Stone	San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. F. L. Hosmer	Berkeley, Cal.
Rev. Thomas L. Eliot, D.D.	Portland, Ore.

The National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.

THE ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL.

The Council of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches congratulates the churches upon the vital interest which attended the session of the Conference just closed. A thousand persons made the cheerful pilgrimage to Saratoga, and four hundred of these were delegates from the churches. The number in attendance is thus seen to be less than on former occasions; but never has there been greater unity of purpose or more vital expression of it.

Certain matters are reported to the churches.

Hon. George F. Hoar, LL. D., who has so long and so ably filled the office of president, felt compelled to decline a re-election; and the Conference placed in the honorable succession of its presidents another distinguished and public-spirited man, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL. D., and selected for vice-presidents Hon. Thomas J. Morris of Baltimore, Hon. George E. Adams of Chicago, Hon. George C. Perkins of San Francisco, Mr. J. Harsen Rhoades of New York, Hon. Francis C. Lowell of Boston, and Hon. Rockwood Hoar of Worcester.

The churches will recognize in the reports of the Conference already published that the educational interests of our people are receiving that attention due them as the part of our work at once most hopeful and most urgent. The Meadville school, which has had so generous a support in the past from the churches, has received recently a gift of fifty thousand dollars, to be called the "Robert Collyer Endowment," and has secured through the generosity of friends of the school some $25,000 toward the building and maintenance of a gymnasium and dining hall, which represents an urgent need of the school. The committee of the alumni and trustees asked the denomination to increase this amount by eleven thousand dollars, so that this needed improvement may at once be made.

In addition to this gift of money, we urge upon our ministers and lay people that the real object of the school is the preparation of men for the ministry. And, while the instruction given at Meadville was never higher than at present, the number of students in the school is not as large as the facilities offered to young men entering the ministry of our churches ought to invite.

The Hackley School, at Tarrytown-on-the-Hudson, under the care of Rev. Theodore C. Williams as headmaster and a corps of able assistant masters, opens its second year with thirty-one boys in residence and five day pupils. The buildings provided through the generosity of Mrs. Hackley and Mrs. Goodhue are rapidly approaching completion, and will afford facilities for an increased number of pupils and the better administration of the school. The Conference heartily approves the proposal made in May last, at the annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association, that an additional dormitory be provided by the denomination at large, to be called "The Edward Everett Hale House;" and for this purpose friends of education among us are asked to contribute $50,000. Prompt responses already received have given us a good beginning in this matter; but it is of great importance, if the school is to be put upon a self-supporting basis, that we shall have room for the number of students necessary to accomplish this result. The chairman of the committee to secure this fund is Rev. James De Normandie, D.D.

The Conference adopted a resolution commending the Prospect Hill School for Girls at Greenfield to the Unitarian churches, and urges that a suitable endowment fund be raised to enable the school to better carry on its work.

In response to appeals from the South the Conference declared that it regards as of peculiar importance the education of the dependent races and those of our white race whose means are slender. It commends the work of the industrial schools at Hampton and Tuskegee and Calhoun as a most effective means to the best results. It also directs attention to the industrial school among the whites at Camp Hill, Ala., as deserving encouragement. All these schools will assist materially in developing better citizenship and higher manhood.

It seems as though nothing stands in the way of the extension of our work in every centre of population in the country except the ability to maintain, during the initial periods of church organization men fit to do the work in these new fields. We ask the denomination to rise to its

opportunity, and give itself and its means for the promulgation of that "good news of God" which we offer. Many able men offer themselves from other denominations for our ministry, whom we cannot place for lack of missionary funds for the planting of new churches; and the splendid youth who are graduating from the theological schools ought not to have the ardor of their spiritual enterprise repressed for lack of work. The condition of the public mind convinces us that, if the churches would place at the disposal of the American Unitarian Association a more generous amount each year, many new fields might be cultivated and the valuable men waiting for work would be added to our active ministry.

We feel sure that the greeting which the Council sent to the International Conference of Unitarian and other liberal thinkers and workers will find an echo in the hearts of all our people.

The members of the Council feel that for the next session of the National Conference, to which we already begin to look forward, plans should be made for a larger representation from the churches, and urges upon the trustees of our churches, that provision shall be made for the presence of delegates, whose expenses shall be paid by the churches, so that this great gathering (which since 1865 has met biennially) may send back from its session intelligent men and women who attended, not only better instructed as to our message which we have to deliver, but rekindled by the sense of fellowship which this Conference undoubtedly promotes. We cannot place too high an estimate upon a gathering of our people which in some degree compensates for the independence of our churches, which, while it promotes freedom, incurs the risks of isolation.

THOMAS R. SLICER, *Chairman of the Council.*
W. W. FENN,
GEORGE BATCHELOR.
F. N. HARTWELL.
C. A. MURDOCK.
(Mrs.) PAUL R. FROTHINGHAM.
WILLIAM HOWELL REED.
SAMUEL M. CROTHERS.
EDWARD C. ELIOT.
(Miss) EMMA C. LOW.
D. W. MOREHOUSE, *Secretary.*
R. C. HUMPHREYS, *Treasurer.*

CONFERENCE SERMON.

THE INTERPRETATION OF LIFE.

BY REV. CHARLES E. ST. JOHN.

If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me.—MATT. xvi. 24.

We are immortal beings,—beings compacted of the germs of all excellence. Each human being is a power, more or less conscious of itself, tending toward the things that are absolutely right. In every soul exists the power of being honorable, faithful, patient, pure in heart; the power of loving, of making sacrifices for the sake of love and righteousness; and especially the power of independent exertion of will. The beginning of the realization of everything that has ever inspired our race lives in these immortal souls of ours. We accept to the full everything that the men of science have established, or may in the future establish, concerning the origin of our souls. We gladly recognize that we are born out of the bosom of this good old earth and its experiences. But notwithstanding all these teachings that may be given us, and reaching far beyond anything that is implied in them, there rises this magnificent perception, which is given to every one of us, that we are immortal beings, conditioned under God to work for the things of God, to take them into our souls as our own and our very self, to guide us from this day on forever more.

Each one, consciously or unconsciously, is already a power of the immortal life. And the deepest thing that is in us, inspiring the exertion of that power of the immortal life, is a great yearning to express these qualities which we dimly know are within us. We desire to put forth the power that we have, and thereby gain more power out of the great realms of God, which in turn we may put forth for the blessing of our brothers and the laying of the earthly foundations of the kingdom of God. We desire, each and every one of us, to express ourselves, our natures, our whole being. We desire in that self-expression and

by that self-expression to bring ourselves into contact with God, so that we shall know day by day more and more about God, and so make him the greatest and nearest reality of all our experience. We desire with this great and wonderful longing to find satisfaction in living, so as to be glad that we are alive day by day, moment by moment, in that we are able in some way to express ourselves, and by the very joy of that expression to come to the consciousness that we have that in us which is worth expressing.

Yet behold the conditions which we find confronting us. Inspired as we are by such magnificent yearnings, such splendid ideals and hopes, we find ourselves faced by a world which seems to be dominated by hardship, by perplexity, by disappointment, by loss, by sorrow, by things that crush our souls. It often seems as if, the harder we tried to express that which is best in us, the more forcibly we come up against those barriers, shall I call them? Whatever they are, we group them under the name of life's discipline. Whoso is bravest seems to have the most to contend against. Whosoever is patent and innocent in his living seems to have the most of affliction turned upon his life.

How are we to interpret this relation between our eager spirits and the world in which we are compelled to live? Grant again everything that the man of science claims under the name of evolution; grant that the experience of our race, and of the creatures from which we descended have brought forth these relations which exist between us and between ourselves and nature. Still, we do not interpret those hard conditions and our relation to them by going back to the beginnings. You cannot interpret anything human by searching out the origin of all things human. The only way to interpret our life is to study our own souls as they are now, conscious of their immortality, conscious of their nearness to the life of God. Let us study human souls and see what is the effect upon them of these conditions of living which are called the disciplines of life. Many interpretations are offered.

There are those who tell us that these hard things in life are dark shadows coming between the light and the creatures of God that cannot live without light. They tell us that these dread things of life are to be likened to a vast swarm of repulsive vultures gathering around that which is about to die. They tell us that these trials are something to be battled with, that they are foes of our finer

being, that they are the instrumentalities of the great enemy of God. They even dare to tell us that these things display the wrath of God. So they interpret life as a hedged in thing, and tell us that our restless spirits are simply chafing under conditions which offer nothing but opposition to everything that is best in the human soul. So they call us to arms whenever they ask us to serve God and humanity, and urge us to come out and fight,—fight our enemies, beat down the things that obstruct our progress.

How easy it is to respond to that great appeal! The challenge to arms moves every strong nature; and when we answer it, and take the world that we live in as a hostile thing, feeling that we are indeed given over by God into the hands of Satan for some mysterious reason ever unknown to us, then how easy it is for us to imagine that, whatever we do, God is on our side, and not on the other side! How easy it is, under that law of living, to imagine that we are following our fine ambition to express our being, when we are simply asserting ourselves in a way that is not noble, but chiefly animated by the desire to win, to put down something, to overcome some force or party, some army or nation that may be opposed to our own! It seems to me that this interpretation of life is deficient in the fundamental principle of Christian living, that of self-denial. A certain type of self-sacrifice appears in the life of the soldier who is the representative of this interpretation of life. Where wars have led men to strive against men with the great ambition of winning victories, there have been many things given up, even life itself. There men have displayed courage, which in the pages of romance and reality alike always inspires us. Yet back of that note of triumph, which comes to us out of the military life, there lies the great, underlying, mournful wail of them that suffer wrong, of them that are beaten down with sorrows that need not have been. So we learn that that kind of self-sacrifice is a self-sacrifice which gets so overwhelmed with the vision of glory as to forget the consequences of rushing onward after glory, as to forget the sorrows, the afflictions, and the sins that have ever followed in the trail of the simple militant life. No, let us seek another interpretation of this life of ours.

There are other people who hold to the opinion that our life is a completed thing, that in the present there is little that is great, that whosoever would come into contact with human greatness, with beautiful living, must go back into

the dim past, where men have indeed wrought wondrously well.' They devote themselves to the purely studious life, knowing, as is very true, that the record of a thousand years of human experience can show very much more of glory and completeness and beauty than can the record laid before us in any one day by the newspapers. So they say this time of ours does not produce those beautiful things that shine out of the records of a thousand years. They say that whosoever would find ideals of righteousness, whosoever would find human strength, the ability and the power of putting forth the things that are great, must go back into the past, and see what men have done. When the ardent souls of the present, active world come to these people who know the goodness of the past, and tell them with brave, young emotion what they mean to do for the uplifting of the world, these who think that life is completed always reply, "That has been tried, my young friend: that has been tried." Everything that you propose to these people "has been tried." And the restless spirit, overcome by the perception of the reality of life so as for a moment to overlook the natural reverence for human experience, can but reply: "Yes, tried by *you;* but *I* have not tried these ways, and *I* propose to try them." Why, it is given to every one who will deeply and nobly understand the possibilities of his being to know that it is not the success of effort that is the chief thing, but the effort itself. Through ages on ages men have tried to do beautiful things, and men for ages and ages to come will patiently and bravely and ignorantly, if you will, go on trying to do these same things, unconsciously aware that it is the trying that brings out human life.

It is the endeavor that makes us be what we can be; and, compared with the endeavor, all the results are as nothing. Heaven lies out there before us; but it is the effort to get there that means something to strong souls, not the living therein. Whosoever found himself in heaven, free from responsibility, free from all difficulty, could do nothing but follow the example of the Master as it is outlined in that fable of ancient Rome. Peter, discouraged by the great difficulty of the task in which he was engaged, had deserted the cause, and was fleeing from that wicked city, when he met the mysterious figure of his Master, and asked him, "Whither goest thou, Lord?" And his master answered, "To Rome." Of course, what could the Master do but turn his back on heaven, and go to the place where the stress of life is most serious? Where can any man, if

he desires to express himself in works that shall be of use to the world, find possibility of expressing himself other than under conditions which are hard? No, life is not a completed thing. Adam and Eve, to turn to another old fable and find a hidden truth in it—Adam and Eve created mature and happy, must of necessity prove to be moral weaklings. Not until the flaming sword blazed between them and their paradise did they begin to do anything for this race or for God.

There is hinted the true interpretation of life,—an interpretation which recognizes this existence of ours as one of responsible progress. These hard things that come down upon us so overwhelmingly are not to be taken as something to be fought against, but as something to be used by souls that know how to employ material that is given to them, used in the cause of all righteousness, used in the putting forth of the power that is in us. Shaped though they may be by human experience, and elaborated before that by the natural processes of evolution, still what they say to us from the great mind of God is, "Here, child of mine, is at last a chance for you to be something stronger and finer than you have ever been before." When the sorrows of my life come down upon me, I may in my human ignorance of the future pray that the cup may pass from my lips; but, when that cup actually touches my lips, then I have a chance to be patient, earnest, consecrated unto all good things, such as I never had before.

How *could* any human soul grown in the power of patience, taking up this germ that is in him by the love of God and making it grow day by day to be larger than it is,—how could he possibly do it unless he had something that required patience of him? How could we by any possibility put forth into the world the splendid influence of purity of heart, unless there were continually confronting us possibilities of being something other than pure in heart? Take any noble quality of our lives, and apply to it that test. You will find that every hardship that comes to any human soul, howsoever excessive the hardship may be, gives him the chance so to use it as to become a better soul than he has been before. He may not be glad that it has come. It may not add to the happiness of his life. Of two men, one of them innocently and jubilantly happy day by day and the other one commanded by a certain fine public spirit and a disciplined self-control under his vision of the things that are—of these two, which one is worth more to you and to this world and to God? Not the

merely happy man ever. Yet I have seen enough of life to dare to believe that, whensoever any human soul takes hold of his life in the spirit of the soldier who goes forth to serve and not simply to fight, and acts constantly by the great purpose of building the kingdom of God and his righteousness,—invariably unto that man there are added certain lesser sweet things of life,—contentment, happiness, or something else which satisfies him just as well.

So in the case of these sorrows, difficulties, afflictions, which we call discipline: it is given to us to put forth our simple human will. It is given to every man to say,—

> **"It matters not how strait the gate,**
> **How charged with punishment the scroll;**
> **I am the master of my fate,**
> **I am the captain of my soul."**

Oh, it is wondrously true that the path of duty is the way to glory; wondrously true that all glory, which can permanently satisfy those who deserve it, all glory which can be laid before God as a tribute to him, is won by those who follow the path of duty, and understand that the path of duty is the daily, patient, splendid dealing with those things that are monotonous and difficult in our several lives. God asks us to be good; and here all around us, like flowers in our way, he scatters opportunities to be good, and to do something that is helpful, something that is patient, something that is pure. He asks us that we follow the Master in the great demonstration of the law of self-sacrifice; and here by our way there are opportunities for us to do that thing, and nothing to prevent us from doing it save the weakness that exists in our souls. The true interpretation of life is one that will help men to see that the hardships of life, the sorrows and the pains of life, are a throne unto which we are all born by virtue of our being heirs of God. It is a throne of power, and whosoever lightly or timidly abdicates that throne does a weak and shameful deed.

We are told by those who do not interpret life on this basis that the picture which is called "The Man with the Hoe" displays the hard and oppressive limitations under which those that toil must ever live. Now far be it from me to say a word which would seem to indicate a lack of sympathy for those who are obliged to toil under circumstances more oppressive than those which I myself have to meet. I venture to claim that I know something about the harder and more oppressive conditions of life; but

because I know these things, and because I have seen human souls dealing with them magnificently, I dare to interpret the most difficult lives by saying, You must round out the picture of "The Man with the Hoe" with another picture of the same artist, "The Angelus," and recognize that at any moment the man with the hoe can find the true meaning of what he is about by lifting up his spirit unto God. At any moment any human being, engaged in whatsoever trials and difficulties and limitations, can take hold of those things, and so deal with them as to wrest all moral possibilities from them, and to rise in majesty before those who observe, and reveal the glory of spiritual living,—gain, in short, the only thing for which an immortal life is given.

Go on doing all that you can for all those who are troubled and oppressed, but do not so belittle their immortal souls as to imagine that you have to change the conditions of their lives before they can find noble expression of what is loveliest in human nature. We all have our chance, and therefore we ought all of us to be glad that we are alive. We ought all of us to go on from the footing where we now stand, and put forth the qualities that are within us by means of the opportunities which God has given us, understanding, through this Christian interpretation of life, that our difficulties are divine opportunities, and not limitations set up by Satan.

The great symbol of the cross of Christ expresses this side of life. Do not think that the cross was a limitation upon the life of Jesus. The cross was to him what these crosses of ours are to us,—his moral opportunity. In the presence of that opportunity, what did he not do for this world of ours! Set forth the cross still as the symbol of the opportunities of life, but say that the life of Christ itself is the symbol of our immortal life. The cross that he bore is but the symbol of the crosses that we bear,—simply the symbol to show us that in the hardships of life appear man's grandest open doors. If life is not hard for anybody, his first duty under God is to go out and find something that is hard. There is no other way to get that cross upon one's shoulder than to go out and find something that is hard. These hopes for easy living, these unappreciative words about a heaven that shall give rest everlasting,—how wide they are from the mark that is set for us by the cross of our Master!

Life, then, is not a battle. Put it the other way, and it will be true: battle is a life. Battle of all kinds gives us

the chance to live, the chance to be men and women, the chance to be heroic, the chance to be divine. Life appeals to us still for the soldierly spirit. But instead of that old-time inspiration which comes to us from the clanking accoutrements of war, instead of that inward exaltation in us which military music calls out, we are coming at last to feel the leadership of Christ, and to see so clearly and so happily the thrilling ideals of the loftiest life that come down to us from God through our teacher as to find in them the same power of appeal that has been given to the soldier of the olden days by the mere call to arms. It is given to us to turn upon these perils of our daily lives instead of fleeing from them when we can; to turn upon them, and take them as the opportunities of our lives in such a fashion that we shall be able to make the books and the tools we use flash continually as with the gleaming of the sword; able to give to the ordinary incidents of our lives the insistence of musketry, and all the power and dignity and lift that romance has thrown into the marching of armies of men and the contending of men on desperate fields of battle.

Action, then, is the keynote of this interpretation of our lives. Being immortal is always better than winning immortality. Building heaven here upon earth is of necessity better for us now than any thought of heaven that is to come, though our hearts are filled with the conviction that an immortal progress lies before us all.

Now it is given to our church, to all churches of the Christian name,—and I dare say to many other churches that do not take the Christian name,—it is given to us to stand upon these massive foundations of faith, and interpret to our land the life that human souls must live. It is given to us to go out and interpret unto a nation that nation's grief,—the greatest work that has ever been undertaken by man. Statesmen may interpret unto their nations the relations between land and land. The teachers whom we honor may interpret unto us the true laws of human society. But the greatest work to which the mind can turn is to go out and interpret unto human souls the griefs that come upon them, to go out and interpret to a nation the underlying divine purposes that are to be found in everything that is sad, in every affliction, in every crime, to see the larger meaning of the hero's death, to go out and show our nation, comrades,—you and I,—to go out and show our nation that by virtue of the underlying justice of God our revered

President has done more for us, more for the progress of righteousness in this world, more for the setting forth of all things that were dear to his heart, by dying with the simple Christian courage that he showed than he possibly could have done by living among us many more years. Whosoever can see these things can teach the whole world to possess their spirits in magnificent patience in recognition of the unfailing law of God, by which we are all always, under all circumstances, controlled. He knows the deeps of life who can interpret unto the land how God, in his infinite wisdom, can take up even the blind wickedness of a fool, and make that a part of the growth of righteousness in a nation.

Whosoever is able to interpret such things, and keep hold of the hand of the present God through all national difficulties and all personal ones,—he is the man and that is the church that in the years that are to come are going to make Christianity the power over reasonable minds that it is surely destined to be. Oh, the joy of it! to be able to make men glad that they are alive, and, though the whole land be swarming with iniquity, to make people see the beauty of the beautiful life and the possibility of making life beautiful in every corner of every city in the world! to be able to go out and show to men that here and now we are living in a golden age! There never will be, there never was *the* golden age. We are living in that which is golden, and that is enough for our satisfaction; for it appeals unto everything that is in us. It draws out all the powers that we have just so fast as they spring up in our being. O Church of God, come ye up to these mountain tops, these peaks of the glory of interpreting life deeply and well. Take these things of faith,—faith in God, faith in your own souls, faith in other souls, faith in the interminable future,—take these splendid things of faith, and go out and interpret them to human souls wheresoever you find any one who does not know that life is a glorious thing.

Give to us for this work, fathers and mothers, your finest youth. Oh, to think of the fathers and mothers that have turned aside brave, young minds that were inclined to go into this ministry of the interpretation of life, turned them aside from that highest of all things human, and asked them to do works that are less potent! Give to us, not the boys and girls that cannot do anything else, but the finest youth of your homes, and we will give them work to do that will strain every nerve in them, and enable them to put forth power upon power, of which they may never dream if they go into any other life.

There lies before the Church of God in this world of ours a destiny compared with which all the glories of the past shall be forgotten. For never, in completeness, in patience, in great breadth of action, has this Christian interpretation of life been given unto man. Here and there in the past we find a man who has been both a hero and a wise soul, and has put forth his activities on such a basis; but the Christian Church as a whole has never even dimly understood the possibility of doing it. When at last the Christian Church does range up to the level of the life of its Master, then it will produce results which will prove how much better than any other sphere for human activity is that offered by the privilege of interpreting life so as to make men glad that they have a chance of grappling with the things that are hard. When that generous gladness comes, then the man who has been moaning because he is down-trodden, wakes up and sees at last that in the fact that he is down-trodden he has a challenge from God which enables him to bring out splendid things in his soul. Rightly proclaimed, this interpretation inspires him to forget his poor oppressor in the splendid joy of the things he is accomplishing by God's grace through the foolishness of the oppressor.

We have got to revolutionize our modern methods of charity. We have got to revolutionize our preaching. We have got to get a new comprehension of the possibilities of Christianity. We are to go forth under the banner of our leader, doing these things. There are many others who are doing it, God be praised! but we are freer in some ways to enter upon this service. Why is it that we are not all on fire, every one who calls himself a Unitarian, on fire with the splendid example that is always set before us by our Master bearing his cross? How is it that each and every one of us, preachers and laity alike, are not eagerly grasping for our cross, in order to go out and follow the Master, and live so gloriously well as to make not only ourselves happy, but to give happiness to many others day by day? It is only the bearing of the cross that will accomplish this. It is only toil that permits high self-expression. It is only they that are pioneers in advancing the interests of humanity that are in the best possible way able to interpret by their actions this glorious human life; and, if we interpret it according to our strength and vision, we can lead the army of those who live thus nobly.

It is your privilege and mine thus to take a manful part in these coming grander days of an enlightened and invig-

orated Christianity. If we will interpret life according to our vision, and live according to our inner strength, making both speech and action proclaim the glory of the doing of duty, we shall render unto God an acceptable sacrifice, and unto men an inspiring service.

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NINETEENTH REGULAR MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

The National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches held its nineteenth session at Saratoga, N. Y., September 23-26 inclusive. The following is a detailed report of the business proceedings and the addresses immediately relating to them.

Monday Evening.

A meeting of the Council was held at 5 P. M.

At 8 P. M. services of worship were held in the Broadway Theatre, in which all the sessions of the Conference were held. The hymns were read by Rev. D. W. Morehouse, responsive services by Rev. E. M. Wilbur. Prayer was offered by Rev. W. F. Skerrye. The Scripture reading followed, and sermon by Rev. Charles E. St. John, secretary of the American Unitarian Association.

Tuesday Morning.

On Tuesday morning the devotional service was conducted at 9.15 A. M. by Rev. B. R. Bulkeley.

At 9.45 A. M. the Conference was formally opened with an address of welcome by Hon. George F. Hoar, its president.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

There can be no more fitting time for our meeting than this time of heavy national sorrow. If we are anything, we are a denomination of good cheer and of good hope. What have we to say of good cheer and of good hope, as we wel-

come each other from all over the continent and from over the sea?

We have just listened to the voice of the civilized world, speaking nearly in one accord as it has seldom spoken before. Modern science has called into life these mighty servants, the press and the telegraph, who have created a nerve which joins together all human hearts, and which pulses simultaneously over the globe.

Was the nobleness of humanity as God created it ever more vindicated than by what has happened now? What emotion has stirred it? A poor fiend has shot off his little bolt. One human life is stricken down, and a throb of love thrills a planet. Could any base or ignoble passion have so moved mankind? Hatred touched a chord, but there came no response save that in a few cellars or garrets, where the enemies of the human race hide themselves as they take counsel together. The victim of the crime uttered only an expression of pity and care for the safety of his enemy, and there is a thrill of sympathy in the bosom of all mankind.

There is another lesson of comfort and good cheer and good hope. It is in the sincere confession which comes from every sect, from every creed, from every church, as to what makes up the essence of Christian character and Christian faith.

President McKinley stated about a year ago what he thought to be the essence of Christianity. This is what he said:

"The religion which Christ founded has been a mighty influence in the civilization of the human race. If we of to-day owed it to nothing more than this, our debt of appreciation would be incalculable. The doctrine of love, purity, and right-living, has step by step won its way into the heart of mankind, has exalted home and family, and has filled the future with hope and promise."

Now a good deal more has happened than an outburst of love and sympathy moved by a tragic scene. Men of all Christian sects are taking this occasion to declare what it is that makes the true Christian, what sort of example men ought to imitate, and what entitles them to the favor of God.

We hear nothing of Athanasian creeds, or of church government, or the Five Points of Calvinism, or Unitarian statements of faith, or church covenants, or decrees of councils. But Catholic and Protestant, and Congregationalist and Presbyterian, and Universalist and Unitarian, and Methodist and Episcopalian, speaking by their most

trusted representatives and their highest authorities, declare that this man's life was Christian, and this man's faith was Christianity.

Unitarianism is not a creed. It is a faith and a hope. It is not a faith and a hope merely. It is a quality of character. It is found in all its essentials, in every denomination of Christians. Fénelon was full of its spirit. It pervades the page of Jeremy Taylor and the poetry of Vaughan and George Herbert. Robinson preached it at Delft-Haven. William Bradford brought it across the water. You can find it sometimes in the early Puritan church covenants, written and signed by men who builded better than they knew. It is a quality of character. The older I grow, what we call Unitarianism, when I think of it, brings to my mind no statement of doctrine, no negation, no affirmation even, but the thought of men and women whom I have known or whose lives I have read. It is a spirit coming from the mingled breath of many Christian souls of all ages, of many nations, and of many climes,—a benignant, tolerant, charitable, cheerful, hopeful, loving, gracious spirit.

Our republic has had much to do with bringing it in. It is the child, or, if not the child of, it goes hand in hand with, the spirit of republicanism in its larger sense, of democracy in its larger sense. The conception of the Deity in every age to nearly all mankind has been largely the result of their conception of what is greatest and most to be honored in humanity.

God, in many ages, has been to mankind nothing but a king or emperor or tyrant. When it was held to be the highest earthly felicity and grandeur to spend life in feasting in a drunken and sensual companionship, Jupiter or Thor or Odin, the gods of mankind, spent their eternity in like fashion.

When the highest conception of human greatness was that of a military conqueror dragging his enemies captives after him, men constructed their God on that pattern. One of the most gentle and tolerant of our early New England preachers told his congregation in the funeral discourse of a sweet and gracious gentlewoman,—

"When the whole army of saints shall follow Christ, the captain of their salvation, in their own order, and the whole rout of sinners and ungodly men shall stand bound before him, Christ shall lead forth his own soldiers, victoriously and gloriously dragging the herd of his spoiled enemies opprobriously after him."

But, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin learned the doctrine of humane quality and dignity in a great republic, they learned with it the Unitarian conception of Deity and of humanity. The tyrant disappeared from religious faith as soon and no sooner than he disappeared from the political State. The tyrant and the conqueror went out, and the father and the brother came in.

When I say that this is Unitarianism, I do not for a moment claim that the men who call themselves Unitarians either monopolize it or even that all of them are free from the old delusion.

There are no loftier statements of the newer and better conception of divinity than are to be found in utterances that come from Catholic, from Presbyterian, and from Calvinistic pulpits. And there are some instances of intolerance and hate and bitter and cruel judgments which come from men who profess a liberal faith, sometimes from Unitarians, and sometimes from men who, as Lowell said of Theodore Parker, are "So-(ultra)-cinian, they shock the Socinians."

But, in general, the relation of tyrant and slave, the false idea of glory which associates it with power and not with love, the denial of freedom either to the thought or the will, has departed, if not wholly, yet very largely, from the world of thought and from the religious and from the political conceptions of the world of thought to which we belong.

The old bigotry, which, if it differ from you, will roast you alive if it can, is in this country not found in religious sects. It has departed almost wholly from party and from sectional strife. It is not found in government: it is found in anarchy. It is not found in religion: it is found only in scepticism. It is not found in faith: it is found in agnosticism. It is leaving Partisanship to enter into Independence.

But you are eager to hear other voices than mine. The Conference is now in order and ready for its work.

Resolutions concerning the conduct of business were presented by George H. Ellis of Boston:

Voted, That officers of the Conference be seated and vote as other members of the body.

Voted, That the Chair appoint a committee of ten to constitute a Business Committee, to which all matters of business be referred.

The following committee was appointed:

Business Committee: Rev. George Batchelor, Mr. George F. Ricker, Dr. F. N. Seabury, Rev. Frederic Gill, Miss Helen S. Garrett, Mr. George O. Morgan, Rev. J. E. Wright, Rev. W. L. Chaffin, Mr. W. F. Hall, Mrs. E. A. Fifield.

Voted, That the programme be carried out as prepared, except as hereafter modified by the Business Committee.

Voted, That no member be allowed to speak beyond the allotted time, except by the approval of a majority, and that no extension of time be granted except by such approval and that Cushing's Manual be adopted.

Voted, That a Committee on Credentials, consisting of five persons, be appointed by the Chair.

Committee on Credentials: Mr. Francis H. Lincoln, Mr. Andrew Halkett, Rev. S. C. Beane, Jr., Rev. Earl M. Wilbur, Rev. William Channing Brown.

Voted, That a Committee on Nominations, consisting of five persons, be appointed by the Chair.

The following Committee on Nominations was appointed: Rev. George A. Thayer, Mrs. Sarah E. Hooper, Rev. W. M. Brundage, Rev. S. B. Stewart, Mr. Duncan Smith.

On motion of Rev. D. W. Morehouse the following persons were elected assistant secretaries: Mrs. Isabel C. Barrows, Rev. S. J. Barrows, Rev. James M. Whiton, Rev. Channing Brown, Mr. Albert Clark, Wm. T. Slater.

On motion the following ushers were elected: Rev. Albert Walkley, Rev. Leon A. Harvey, Rev. William L. Walsh, Rev. S. J. Mitchell.

The report of the Council was read by Rev. Howard N. Brown.

By the direction of the Council and in its name, Rev. Howard N. Brown presented the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That this Conference hereby expresses its sorrow for the untimely death of the late beloved President of the Republic, William McKinley; its admiration for the qualities of mind and heart which have so greatly endeared him to the American people; and its horror of the crime which so wantonly occasioned this great public bereavement.

Resolved, That this Conference hereby expresses its sense of the loss which our Unitarian churches have sustained through the deaths of Hon. Roger Wolcott of Massachusetts and Hon. Dorman B. Eaton of New York. The names and the virtues of these eminent citizens and public servants, who were both vice-presidents of this Conference, have been a source of inspiration to our whole religious fellowship; and their memory will be long cherished among us with grateful pride.

The resolutions above were adopted by a rising vote.

Rev. J. P. Forbes of Brooklyn, N. Y., addressed the Conference on the work of the American Unitarian Association.

The PRESIDENT.—We are now to hear something of two things which have no terrors for us Unitarians, "Retrospect and Prospect." That is true, whether you are thinking of this world or any other.

Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D., of Boston, then spoke on "A Retrospect."

The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose if every man and woman in this audience got into a corner and were cross-examined by a good shrewd lawyer as to what really was the inducement that brought him on here, nearly every one would own up that the principal thing was the hope of seeing and hearing Edward Everett Hale. We look into the newspapers as we are making up our minds whether we will come; and, if we find that Dr. Hale is coming, we know it will be a good Conference, and we come if we can. Dr. Hale knows almost everything. [Laughter.] I never caught him tripping about any kind of human knowledge; and, if there is any department about which he doesn't know facts, he will write a mighty good fiction about it. [Laughter.] But he doesn't know half how much his countrymen love him. [Applause.] He is going to speak to us now; and I want you all to rise up when he comes forward, and say, God bless him.

The audience rose and applauded as Dr. Hale stepped forward on the platform. Dr. Hale spoke on "A Prospect."

The introduction of new business was in order. Mrs. Fayette Smith presented a resolution concerning the Prospect Hill School. Referred to the Business Committee.

A resolution concerning industrial schools in the South was presented by Rev. Channing Brown. Referred to the Business Committee.

THE HACKLEY SCHOOL.

After a resolution in regard to the Hackley School had been introduced, Rev. M. J. Savage, D.D., was recognized by the chairman, and said:—

I am here to say a few words because the matter of education has been introduced. Ever since I have been interested in Unitarian affairs, there are two things which have troubled and have grieved me. One is that Unitarian fathers and mothers have seemed to take so little interest

in the religious education of their children. There is hardly a city in America that has not in it a large number of men and women whose fathers and mothers were Unitarians, but who are now helping on the prosperity of churches of other names, while our own churches are many times weak and struggling and specially needing their aid. This means that our boys and girls have not been trained to understand and appreciate the value of those principles that those of us who have made a study of them have come so to love. I was not, as some of you know, trained in the Unitarian Church; but I was trained to think that the kind of religious education that I received was important, that it was something to be sought for wherever I might go in any part of the country.

The other thing that has troubled and grieved me has been to see how little appreciation there seems to have been on the part of Unitarian fathers and mothers of the necessity of a religious education for their own boys and girls. Not only do they give them no home training, apparently, but they send them to schools where they are educated out of what little Unitarianism they may have in any way received. One of the commonest things in the world is to see fathers and mothers sending their boys to a school where they know that every effort will be brought to bear upon them to graduate them into some church. A prominent Episcopalian connected with an Episcopal school said only a little while ago, "We are glad to have you send your boys to us, but we wish you to understand that we shall make Episcopalians of them if we can." Yet, in the face of that declaration, for the sake of having a boy in a large school or a popular school or in a school where he would be associated with the rich or families of social standing, or because there is a large athletic team,—for one or another reason of this sort, fathers or mothers will send their children to schools of this kind without any reference to the religious training they will receive. I have known a case in New York where a Unitarian family were considering where they should send their boy; and they were reasoning the problem not as to where he was to receive religious education, but as a simple matter of athletics, a matter of a large class, where he would be brought into advantageous social relations with other families.

There has been a good excuse within certain limits for this kind of action in the past, for it has been frequently said that we have had no distinctively Unitarian schools to

which we could send our boys; but we have one now. Out of a generous, noble, loving heart a great school has been born. It has one of the finest locations in the world. I do not believe there is a more beautiful site for a school on this planet than that which is occupied by the school for boys at Tarrytown-on-the-Hudson. We have a corps of teachers unsurpassed. One of the largest and most popular schools in this country has been proving this fact by trying to get away from us one of our submasters. There is no out about the school in any way whatever. What does it need? It needs backing. And I wish to say here, practically and plainly, one or two things which perhaps I can say better than almost anybody else. The generous woman who has founded this school has already put into it more than $200,000 to get it born. She does not hesitate to commit herself to giving more. Indeed, I believe the school will be a success if nobody else lifts a finger. But I happen to know that she has been deeply touched by the fact that only one person in this country has uttered an "Amen" loud enough to be heard from one State to another. It has been a grief to her, I know, to find that the Unitarian denomination has not cared enough about it, apparently, to second, in any effective way, her effort. It is not only that she wants your money, she wants to know that you care for what she is trying to do. [Applause.]

What is the condition of the school? We are able to take care of about twenty-five boys. From all over the country there are coming applications for admission to the school which we are obliged to refuse. One generous, noble woman in New York has given money for an administration building; and this is in process of construction. It will be completed some time in early winter. The founder of the school, seeing that there was no assistance immediately coming from any other source, has given enough outright to build a new dormitory, which is in process of construction; but it will not be completed in time for the opening of the school in the fall, so that we shall not be able to care for more than the twenty-five scholars that we had last year.

There is no limit to the possible greatness of this school. I believe that it is destined to be one of the famous institutions of this country in the coming century. Located there on the edge of a population in one city greater than the population of England under Henry VIII., having a million more than the entire population of this country at the time of the Revolution, and with the whole country

back of it from the Atlantic to the Pacific, what are the possibilities as to the growth of a noble school that shall stand for our traditions and help carry on our work? Some one has indicated here this morning that our ministry has not been fed. When our young people, for almost any fanciful, whimsical reason, are ready to go into other churches; when their fathers and mothers have not informed them that it is important to stand by their own principles,—how can we expect our ministry to be fed? We have an opportunity to train our young men and our young women. I am here to ask who will second the efforts already made.

There is one specific and important reason why you should. You are aware that a resolution was adopted in Boston last year to build an Edward Everett Hale House. Very little yet has been done. This perhaps can be accounted for by the fact that only the summer has passed, that people have been scattered, and interested in a thousand other affairs; but now, it seems to me, is the time for us to rally around two things: the success, the honor, the prosperity of this our first distinctive great boys' school; and the next is to build a fitting monument to Edward Everett Hale. [Applause.]

Our president this morning said that Dr. Hale knew almost everything. There is one thing he does not know,—his modesty blurrs the clearness of his vision in this direction: he does not know how much we Unitarians in this country love, admire, and honor him. When Edward Everett Hale ceases to be visible in our gatherings and on our streets,—and God grant that the time may be far distant!—then shall we wake up to the fact, which all this country knows, that one of the greatest men of America has been our beloved Edward Everett Hale. [Applause.] He is not only great as a Unitarian minister; but what phase of our American life that makes for the civilization of the world has he not touched, and borne in it a distinguished part? Let us, then, put to blush his modesty, and let him know while he lives how we care for him and how we love him; and let us at once build this monument to his memory that shall go on for a century or a thousand years doing work that he has loved.

And now I wish to say one word in regard to the financial relation of New York City to this further work. I shall have to speak of a few personal things, in order to make myself clear. I believe that the most of this $50,000 that we want must come from New England just at the

present time. I wonder how many of you happen to know that during the last six years the members of the Church of the Messiah have given annually more money for Unitarian work than the entire annual income of the American Unitarian Association, and this besides the contribution that it has made to the Association itself. I happen to know (Mr. Slicer would not care to tell you) that, to meet a great exigency in their charitable work in New York, they have been obliged in his church to raise $50,000 in their own membership. Mr. Wright's church is not in a condition to accomplish a great deal in this direction at present. I say, then, that the most of this money we must look for from New England, but I will promise you this: when any other church in the United States, for distinctly Unitarian purposes, shall have contributed during the next year one-half as much as the Church of the Messiah has been giving for several years, I will pledge that the Church of the Messiah shall at least match any sum raised for the Edward Everett Hale House within the limits of any one church. [Applause.]

The Chair announced that contributions for that admirable memorial, the Edward Everett Hale House, might be made to William Howell Reed.

GEO. H. ELLIS.—I do not like to see the Hackley School matter left where Dr. Savage has left it. It does seem to me that we need to consider that matter right here and now. We have before us a specific plan to raise $50,000 for an Edward Everett Hale House. Here and now is the time to raise that money. If I were only rich, I should be glad to make to-day a splendid contribution myself. I am to do the next best thing in offering a contribution of one of our young New England laymen, the devoted son of an honored father,—Mr. Horace S. Sears,—who gives $1,000. [Applause.] I wish that he were here to speak more effectively than I can, but I think no one needs to speak more feelingly than has Dr. Savage. It seems to me that after his appeal, backed up by the subscription and work of Mrs. Hackley and Mrs. Goodhue, it is impossible for us to leave this without closing it at once. It is not right that when a person is willing to contribute to the Unitarian cause, as Mrs. Hackley has done, she should be left by herself. There is a little human nature in all of us, and we work better when we work together. [Applause.]

PROSPECT HILL SCHOOL.

Rev. HENRY F. BOND.—I have a word to speak about the other distinctively Unitarian school,—that one at Prospect Hill in Greenfield, which should be the school in our hearts in behalf of our growing girls, as the Hackley School is to be for the boys. When any application is made for a fund for that school, I certainly hope it will be very generously responded to. If one-tenth part as generously as to the Hackley School, that will furnish a good beginning of a fund which it has struggled on without. This school was organized by my dear friend, one whom you should also have in tender remembrance, Dr. John F. Moors. Do not forget the school in Greenfield which is so well conducted at the present time.

Rev. Francis W. Holden emphasized the need of the school for girls. He is the minister of the town where they have what is advertised as a non-sectarian school. He referred to Wheaton Seminary. Half of the scholars are Unitarians, yet in the five years that he had been there those girls had been in the Unitarian church but twice. He urged them to send their girls to Prospect Hill.

Senator HOAR.—The Chair is authorized to announce that another layman desires to add $500 for a contribution to the Edward Everett Hale fund. [Applause.] This generous layman desires his name to be withheld, and the Chair respects his wish.

On motion of Rev. Louis H. Buckshorn, it was voted that at the next full meeting of the Conference the Chair announce a committee to take contributions, and that opportunity be given to everybody present to contribute. Referred to Business Committee.

A resolution concerning the International Council of Unitarian and Other Liberal Thinkers and Workers presented by Rev. Samuel Crothers was referred to the Business Committee.

At 12.45 P. M. Conference adjourned.

WOMEN'S NATIONAL ALLIANCE.

A meeting of the Women's National Alliance was held in the same hall at 2.15 P. M. Addresses were given by the presiding officer, Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells, and by Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, Mrs. Barnes, Mrs. A. B. Bradley, Mrs. C. F. Smith, Mrs. E. H. Atherton.

The meeting was followed by a reception from 5 P. M. to 6.30 P. M. in the parlors of the United States Hotel.

TUESDAY EVENING.

Conference was called to order at 8 P. M., Hon. Thomas J. Morris in the chair. After the singing of the hymn an address was delivered by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, Washington, D. C., on "The Church at Work."

Addresses were given on "The Church at Worship" by Rev. William M. Brundage, Ph.D., Albany, and Rev. Lewis G. Wilson, Hopedale, Mass.

WEDNESDAY MORNING.

Devotional service was conducted by Rev. William Lloyd.

At 9.40 A. M. the Conference was called to order by Hon. Thomas J. Morris.

Rev. George Batchelor, chairman of the Business Committee, reported the following resolution:—

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER LIBERAL THINKERS.

Resolved, That this Conference sends greetings to the International Council of Unitarian and Other Liberal Thinkers and Workers, and congratulates the Council over its successful meetings in Boston and London. The Unitarian churches of America, represented in this Conference, desire to express their sympathy with those movements in many lands and under various names which aim at a free and rational expression of religious sentiment.

Rev. SAMUEL M. CROTHERS, D. D.—I want to say at this time just a word in regard to the purpose of this new organization,—the organization of Unitarian and Other Liberal Thinkers and Workers organized in Boston and meeting in May this year in the city of London. It was my privilege to accompany Mr. Wendte as representative of the American Unitarian Association at this meeting in London. I wish I might be able to bring back something of the spirit that animated that remarkable conference, a conference remarkable in numbers and in the unity and enthusiasm represented at the London meeting. From the beginning to the end, this enthusiasm was manifested, and almost all of our English friends to whom I spoke felt as if it were a new birth of our movement in England and a great enlargement of it on the continent of Europe. I think that the crisis through which we have been passing, and through which we are passing still, —the crisis of organized Unitarianism,—has come from

the very success of those principles with which Unitarianism began,—principles of liberty and reason in religion. When the Unitarian Association was founded, organized Unitarianism stood almost alone for these things. The one thing in the last generation has been the growth of the liberal sentiment through all churches; and the question has been, How shall we adjust ourselves as Unitarians to this new movement? One way is to give up our interests in our organized work, to merge ourselves at once in the larger movement of our time; but about this many of us feel, as did the Englishman, in Anstey's story, when he attended a meeting of Esoteric Buddhists and was told that the great object of life is to lose one's self and be absorbed in Buddha, and the very sensible answer was: "I don't propose to do anything of the kind; it would not do Buddha any good, and it would be the end of me." [Laughter.]

Now any premature absorption into that which is nebulous is, I think, something which we do not feel to be the part of wisdom.

Another way in which we may act is to ignore the facts which are around us, ignore the larger movements of our time, and give ourselves more earnestly to strictly denominational thought and work,—act as if nothing had happened, doing our part as best we may, but unconscious of our relations to the larger work that is around us and the larger movement of our time. We may try to do that: there is no harm in trying to do it. The main difficulty with it is that it is so deadly uninteresting. [Laughter.] If I were a young man, I should not be what is called a "Little Englishman," for the reason that England by itself is too little. I should want to have my interests in the great federation of which England is but a part, and glory in that and work for that. "The destruction of the poor is their poverty," and the destruction of a sect lies in its sectarianism. It is but an uninteresting work to repeat over and over a denominational formula in this age of ours, with its varied thought and its new Unitarianism; and I should hate to think of Unitarianism becoming simply a sect in that sense, like a little innocent bird that hath but one plaint, a few notes, and sings that passage away and o'er for all an April morning until the ear wearies to hear it. I get tired of hearing our Unitarian formula expressed in a purely sectarian way.

Now the promising thing was the way in which the Unitarian Association, in its meeting more than a year

ago, gave its sanction to the new movement, not giving up the Unitarian name or minimizing it, yet inviting freely and frankly all liberal thinkers and workers who are caring for the same thing to meet in perfect equality for consultation and for enthusiasm. The significant thing in the meeting at London was that those other liberal thinkers and workers from the continent of Europe accepted that invitation in good faith. Men like Prof. Eerdmans of Leyden, representing the liberal movement of the Dutch church, came with hearty greetings and the greatest sympathy. Men in Germany, like Prof. Pfleiderer, entered most heartily into the movement; and Prof. Pfleiderer, though unable to come himself, sent a most stirring paper. Men came representing the liberal movement in Switzerland, in France, in Scandinavia, in Italy. The Unitarians of England felt themselves to be no longer dissenters, but to be members of a great world movement; and they felt that, as Unitarians, they might be leaders in that movement. This conference had the same enthusiasm for humanity, the same breadth of sympathy, manifested by the Parliament of Religions in Chicago. It had the advantage of being connected with a nucleus of established churches,—churches actually working for the bringing in of this larger type of religious thought and feeling. It is that which seemed to me to be the significance of this meeting in London,—the emphasis upon the world movement of which they are a part. In offering this resolution, I have in mind the largeness of opportunity that comes to us, and the fact that it is practicable to unite our Unitarian movement to these various movements in all lands of the earth that are working for a broader and freer religion.

The resolution was passed.

THE HACKLEY SCHOOL.

The Business Committee reported favorably the following resolution:—

This Conference accepts the recommendation of the Council, that $50,000 be immediately raised to build the Edward Everett Hale House at the Hackley School, and that we urge the completion of this project, both for the sake of the school and also to establish in connection with the education of our boys a memorial of the name most honored among us.

Passed.

Mr. BATCHELOR.—This Conference yesterday began to appoint a committee to take a collection on the floor of the house for the Hackley School. The transaction was not completed, and your Business Committee report:—

Resolved, That it is not advisable to take such a collection here, but instead to take the usual measures to defray the expenses of the Conference.

Passed.

Mr. William Howell Reed announced that another subscription of $1,000 had been received on condition that $4,000 more was raised at the Conference. Two other sums of $1,000 each had been given before the Conference assembled, so that they had in all some $3,500 or $4,000.

PROSPECT HILL SCHOOL.

The Business Committee reported favorably the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Prospect Hill School for girls, an institution located in Greenfield, Mass., incorporated under the laws of that State, and under the control of the American Unitarian Association, and holding property in trust for educational purposes and for that Association, founded and fostered with unremitting care by the late Rev. John F. Moors, D.D., is indorsed by the National Conference as being in every way worthy the patronage of Unitarian parents and the gifts of generous persons interested in promoting the higher education of girls under unsectarian influences. And the Conference urges that a suitable endowment fund be raised to enable the school better to carry on its valuable work.

Miss IDA FOSTER.—During the past few days at the United States Hotel, I have been grieved a little to find so many people who have not that realizing sense of the importance of Prospect Hill School that I want them to have. So I feel the concern laid on me, as my ancestors would have said, to say a few words in behalf of that institution.

Mr. Hoar said yesterday, in addressing the Conference, that Unitarianism was not a creed, but a faith and a hope; and not merely a faith and a hope, but a quality of character. Now the Prospect Hill School is engaged in developing that quality of character in young women which is distinctly in line of Unitarian faith and hope, that quality of character which tends to service for the world. Latin and algebra are not neglected as educational influences, but they come afterward. Character-building is our work, first and foremost; and perhaps in that we are trying first to seek the kingdom of God. Meeting Dr. Ames on the train from Boston, I was delighted to have him uncon-

sciously, in a joking way, sum up the work of Prospect Hill School. He said he supposed it would be an object to us to catch him young and make a good girl of him. We confess reluctantly that it is too late to hope for any such good results from Dr. Ames. [Laughter.] But we believe that there are a great many other young Americans who are not such hopeless cases. [Laughter.] If we can catch them young, we will try to make good girls of them and good women. Surely, the development of a true and strong womanhood, considering the work which women have to do in America at the present day, is not a small or unimportant thing.

A great many people have said to me that they didn't know that there was any distinctively Unitarian school for girls. There are schools managed by Unitarians, but they are largely in the ownership of the managers. So far as I know, ours is the only one distinctively Unitarian in all aspects; but there is that one. It owns its real estate, and that is all it has. It has not a dollar of funded capital from which to draw an income; but its real estate is held by the American Unitarian Association, the nomination of its trustees is confirmed by that Association. Both of its principals are Unitarian; and all of its principles are Unitarian, if you spell it the other way. Its senior principal is a Unitarian and its matron, and every one of its trustees is Unitarian; and, as for Unitarian influence,—well, like Wheaton Seminary, we call ourselves non-sectarian. We take an interest in all the larger work. We do not coerce the choice of church attendance in our favor. We have girls from other denominations, who may go to hear ministers of their own churches. We had a girl from the West a year ago, of the most rigid Orthodox origin; and her refusal to attend Unitarian services was so insolently indignant and so contemptuous of any ideas we represent that after the first month she was not invited to attend these services. But the atmosphere and general air of the place was such that this person came again in tears to the principals at the end of the year; and her revolt took this form: "Well, I think I might be allowed to attend a Unitarian church once in a while." Remember that, if orthodox girls are gathered into the Unitarian fold with such ease as that, Unitarian girls must be gathered into orthodox folds just as easily. Prospect Hill has a fine opportunity to be active in warfare for the Lord. I think she has the men behind the gun, but she has not the guns. [Laughter.] We are in the position of the Israelites in

Egypt. We are trying to make bricks without straw, and, notwithstanding that disadvantage, we are turning out a pretty good quality of brick. [Laughter.] One of your valued Unitarian ministers in the West was a graduate of Prospect Hill; and Miss Hattie A. Boyd, whom some of you have heard of as excavating in Crete under the auspices of the American Archæological Society, is a Prospect Hill girl and fitted there for college. There are a good many more that I might mention, if it were best to take your time.

Now I rejoice just as much as any one can at the great prospect before Hackley Hall. I am glad that Hackley has such a chance. I am glad that the school has such spokesmen as Dr. Savage; but is it not late in this age of civilization, to let the girls go floating down the Ganges to the crocodiles? [Applause and laughter.] I do not mean that as a reflection upon our orthodox brethren. [Laughter.]

Hackley and Prospect Hall are in no sense rivals; they stand side by side, as they ought to, in the education of American youth; and the girls of the Unitarian body will be the mothers of the next generation of the Hackley boys. Is it not well that they should be developed in the line of strong hearts and trained minds and confirmed habits of usefulness? Now any established institution of whatever nature, commercial, maritime, scientific, cannot be started and then let go. If it is not supported, and the waste of tissue resupplied, it will deteriorate. If that is true of a shoe factory or of glass works, it is far truer of an educational institution that must have a continuous flow to keep it abreast of the times and supply those needs which make it a valuable institution year after year. It ought not to be allowed to do its work and drop into the background; it ought to be kept going. So this idea of an endowment is forcing itself more and more upon the people who have the work of Prospect Hill at heart. It has passed beyond the idea that might be represented by a hammock on the piazza of a Sunday afternoon, it is not an umbrella in a sun-shower: it is more than a matter of convenience,—it is a life preserver in a storm at sea, it is a matter of safety in a time of trouble.

Dr. Hale said to me last night that he was sorry that he was not going to be here to-day to speak to this resolution, because he knew more of the needs of Prospect Hill and its work than anybody else; and we are sorry that he is not here to give us that help, and feel that we are justified in asking for ourselves. Prospect Hill is a good, healthy,

growing institution. It is doing a great work. Do not let it fail of a word of encouragement just to-day, when you get up that endowment on the strength of which we may by and by ask for an endowment when our turn may come. [Applause.]

The resolution was passed.

CAMP HILL SCHOOL, ALABAMA.

Rev. Lyman Ward of Camp Hill, Ala., was invited to address the Conference for five minutes upon the needs of that school.

Rev. LYMAN WARD.—I am exceedingly grateful for the opportunity, even for one minute, to speak this morning of the needs of a vanquished people. We to-day are reminded as never before of the importance of education in the line of the dependent blacks and Indians within our borders, but also that in order that these dependent brothers of ours may not pull us down. As Dr. Curry has so eloquently said of the white race, we must educate them and educate ourselves if we would prove worthy of the citizenship that our fathers have made possible for us. I remember a few years ago in the city of New York of hearing one of our greatest citizens, Mr. Booker T. Washington, say in almost tragic tones that, unless you can lift the white man at the South, you can never hope to fully lift the black man. And one day, with this in view, I left my Northern home, and went down with my own hands to see what I could do for the white race of the South. It had been said that the white man was not willing to work with his hands, that he simply wanted to lord it over his fellows. So I went down there with the sole purpose of finding out whether the white man was willing to work or not.

In the six years in which I have engaged in this work, I have had more than five hundred applications from worthy boys and girls from the South, appealing to me for aid,—not asking for money, as a beggar would ask, but asking simply that they might be allowed to work with their own hands and to get for the reward of their labors that of which Emerson sang when he said, "I am one with the sphere, the seven stars, and the solar year." To-day these dependent sons of our own white race are at our very doors, asking for help. We cannot give them a stone. Our gospel is to own our own land, to raise our own food, to make our own buildings and furniture, and to be, so far

as possible, self-supporting. We have a plantation of some six hundred acres of land. We have built our own school building, which is a credit to our part of the country. We have some hundred students or more. I am a member of a liberal sect myself. I believe in this glorious propaganda of a Unitarian faith. I wish you would go into every city of the South.

I am not appealing to Unitarians alone: I am appealing to this glorious Union of ours that changed our social conditions in the South. I am asking that, as you sent your best beloved to change those conditions, as you sent your money and your prayers,—I am asking that in these glorious days of peace you may again send your best blood down there into the cotton valley States to work for these vanquished ones. Education and enlightenment are the liberators. Ignorance is the one thing to fear. Last Thursday, in my school-room at Alabama, we decided to hold, in gracious memory of your President and ours, a little service. I could not think of the word to say; but I decided that, if my students were willing,—every son and daughter of whom came from "rebel" ancestors,—I would read to them the tale of poor Philip Nolan. And so Thursday morning, with no word from me,—for I had none that I could utter,—I read to those beautiful blue-eyed boys the tale of Philip Nolan; but, after reading that story to them,—it was a day when we could do nothing else,—I told Edward Everett Hale the story, and he wants to send to those boys and girls that beautiful book. [Applause.]

TUSKEGEE SCHOOL, ALABAMA.

On motion it was unanimously voted to ask Mr. Robert W. Taylor to speak to the Conference on the Tuskegee School.

ROBERT W. TAYLOR.—A temperance lecturer once, by way of introduction, said to his audience that he was to speak on alcoholic liquors, and that he expected he would speak quite a long time because he was full of his subject. [Laughter.] I have been given five minutes. However full I may be of my subject, common decency dictates that I should not go over that time. Almost from the beginning of Mr. Washington's efforts at Tuskegee for lifting his brethren the Unitarians have given him an unstinted measure of their support and confidence. They have not withheld from him their purse. They have given him their

praise and their prayers. What have been the results? Beginning twenty years ago with thirty pupils, later buying a piece of land, too poor upon which, it was thought, to raise even a decent disturbance [laughter], to-day that same land is raising sufficient food produce to sustain more than 1,300 students that are housed and taught in forty-eight buildings, largely of their own construction. By their brain and their brawn, these students have erected these buildings; and by their deed they have proved false the Latin maxim, the English of which is, "Out of nothing, nothing comes."

Again, when Mr. Washington went to Tuskegee, he found his brethren groping in darkness and superstition, crying like infants in the night. Every step was one of hesitation and indecision, almost of despair; but to-day you find diffused everywhere in the community men and women of enterprise, acting in grateful determination that the world shall be better for their living in it. Hundreds of men and women have come to this institution and caught its inspiration, and returned to their homes to arouse their people from the sleep of death and inspire them with an ambition to rise. It matters not how many finely spun theories we may have about reaching the masses, the only way to do it is to teach them that they have in themselves the elements of self uplift. When I was at Tuskegee, it was hardly known outside of the State of Alabama. To-day it is known beyond the mighty deep. The attention of the Emperor of Germany is called to it. He finds there that there is no sham, no show, no sentimentality; but earnestness, conscientiousness, thoroughness, characterize everything that we do. He enters into negotiation with its principal for some of the graduates to go into German colonies and introduce cotton-raising. This is a tribute paid Tuskegee by the ruler of one of the greatest nations because he believes that Tuskegee has something to contribute that is of value to the old civilization, and he thinks not of their previous condition, but of their competency. Mr. Washington considers that by the standard of their efficiency in the long run is mankind judged, and by this standard shall the negro rise or fall, be saved or crushed. Along these lines we mean to continue working, —working in the field, working with the anvil, working with the pen. For he who works thinks; and he who thinks is born of God, for God is thought. [Applause.]

The following resolution was reported by the Business Committee:

In view of the stress laid by the chairman of the Council in his address to the Conference upon the importance of our care for the education of our youth, we regard peculiarly important the education of the dependent races and those of our white race whose means are slender. We recommend the industrial schools as exemplified at Hampton and Tuskegee as a most effective means to the best results. We also regard the Industrial School among the whites at Camp Hill, Ala., as highly deserving encouragement. All these schools will assist materially in developing a better citizenship and a higher manhood.

Voted.

Rev. M. J. Savage, D. D., New York, and Rev. James H. Ecob, D. D., of Philadelphia, gave addresses "On the Gospel of the Twentieth Century."

Mr. Richard C. Humphreys, treasurer of the Conference, stated the need of a collection to help defray the expenses of the Conference, asking for about $200 for this purpose. A collection was taken, and the contribution amounted to $283.80.

Rev. William C. Gannett of Rochester, N. Y., read a paper on "The Minister's Adjustment to New Conditions."

The Conference adjourned at 12.40 P. M.

UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The Unitarian Sunday-School Society held a meeting at 2.30 P. M., conducted by Rev. Edward A. Horton, its president. Addresses were given by Rev. George Batchelor, editor of the *Christian Register,* on "Child, Church, and Citizen"; by Mrs. Clara Bancroft Beatley, on "The Place of Imagination in Religious and Moral Education"; by Rev. J. H. Crooker, D. D., Ann Arbor, Mich., on "The Bible in the Light of the Twentieth Century"; by Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson, Newton, Mass., on "The Ideal Teacher."

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

The Conference reconvened at 7.45 P. M., Judge Morris in the Chair.

Miss Jane Addams of Hull House, Chicago, Ill., gave an address on "Settlement Methods."

In the absence of Prof. C. Sprague Smith, of Columbia University, Rev. Thomas R. Slicer of New York spoke on "The Church and the Unchurched."

Prof. Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia University, New York, read a paper on "Sociology."

Adjourned.

THURSDAY MORNING.

The devotional service was conducted by Rev. J. T. Sunderland.

Conference convened at 9.45 A. M., Judge Morris in the Chair.

The chairman of the Committee on Credentials, Francis H. Lincoln, reported that one hundred and sixteen churches and organizations were officially represented by three hundred and thirty-two delegates. The number of persons attending the Conference cannot be aggregately estimated, but the number of those present at the meeting is estimated to be about one thousand.

A resolution presented by Rev. William Walsh concerning the present Building Fund of the proposed gymnasium and dining hall at Meadville Theological School was referred to the Business Committee.

Prof. Francis A. Christie, Meadville, Pa., read a paper on "The Idea of the Church Historically Considered."

Mr. Frank Moss of New York spoke on "The Churches' Interest in Good Government."

Rev. Dr. James M. Whiton spoke on "The New Federation of Churches and Other Religious Organizations."

Judge Morris spoke on "Conditions of City Government in Baltimore." (The discussion on Mr. Moss's paper will be published with the abstract of his address.)

The Business Committee reported the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the Conference heartily recommends to the churches of our faith the completion of the fund for erecting at Meadville, Pa., the much-needed gymnasium and dining hall for the uses of the Meadville Theological School. The generosity of an honored and venerable Unitarian layman, seconded by a few other persons, enables the committee in charge of this work to report that, of the whole sum needed, $2,000 has been subscribed conditional upon the completion of the subscription. $35,000 in all is desired, $24,000 has been subscribed, and the Conference trusts that the $11,000 needed will be speedily subscribed. Subscriptions should be sent to Rev. William L. Chaffin of North Easton, Mass.

Resolved, That the Conference hereby expresses its appreciation of and thanks for the work of the ladies of the National Alliance who decorated and beautified the platform of this hall for the sessions of the Conference.

Resolved, That after long and faithful service the president of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches asks to be released from further responsibility. While with regret we accept the resignation, we are exceedingly grateful for the service he has rendered in the past. By his dignity,

justice, urbanity and religious enthusiasm, he has made still more honorable an office already illustrious for eminent ability and high character of his predecessors. Trusting that he may long be seen in our ranks of the manly virtues, we wish him many years of public service with abundant honor.

Passed with a rising vote.

The following nominations were presented by the Nominating Committee:—

President, Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL. D., Washington, D. C. *Vice-Presidents:* Hon. George E. Adams, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. Thomas J. Morris, Baltimore, Md.; Hon. George C. Perkins, San Francisco, Cal.; Mr. J. Harsen Rhoades, New York, N. Y.; Hon. Francis C. Lowell, Boston, Mass.; Hon. Rockwood Hoar, Worcester, Mass. *Secretary,* Rev. D. W. Morehouse, New York, N. Y. *Treasurer,* Mr. Richard C. Humphreys, Boston, Mass. *Council:* Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, New York, N. Y.; Rev. W. W. Fenn, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Paul R. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Frank N. Hartwell, Louisville, Ky.; Mr. Charles A. Murdock, San Francisco, Cal.; Rev. George Batchelor, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Samuel M. Crothers, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.; Miss Emma C. Low, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mr. William H. Reed, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Edward C. Eliot, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. D. W. Morehouse, New York, N. Y., *ex officio;* Mr. Richard C. Humphreys, Boston, Mass., *ex officio.*

COMMITTEE ON FELLOWSHIP.

New England States.—Rev. W. L. Chaffin, North Easton, Mass.; Rev. Austin S. Carver, Worcester, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Horton, Boston, Mass.

Middle States.—Rev. D. W. Morehouse, New York, N. Y.; Rev. D. M. Wilson, New York; Rev. James T. Bixby, Ph. D., Yonkers, N. Y.

Western States.—Rev. Franklin C. Southworth, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Mary A. Safford, Des Moines, Ia.; Rev. Albert Lazenby, Chicago, Ill.

Southern States.—Rev. G. A. Thayer, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. C. A. Langston, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Marion Ham, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Pacific States.—Rev. George W. Stone, San Francisco, Cal.; Rev. F. L. Hosmer, Berkeley, Cal.; Rev. Thomas L. Eliot, D. D., Portland, Ore.

An opportunity was given to present new nominations. None were presented, and on motion the secretary was directed to cast one ballot for the officers reported by the

Nominating Committee. The vote was cast, and the president announced the officers elected.

UNITARIAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

At 2 P. M. a meeting was held in the interest of the Unitarian Temperance Society. Richard C. Humphreys of Boston presided. Addresses were made by Rev. William C. Gannett of Rochester, N. Y., and Rev. William L. Walsh of Brookfield, Mass., and by Rev. Albert Lazenby, Chicago, Ill.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S RELIGIOUS UNION.

A meeting of the Young People's Religious Union was held at 4 P. M. in the parlors of the United States Hotel. After a reception of an hour, addresses were given by Mr. Percy A. Atherton on "What the Union can do for Religious Progress" and by Rev. Charles E. St. John on "What the Union signifies to our Church."

THURSDAY EVENING.

Conference called to order at 8 P. M., Judge Morris in the Chair.

Rev. Edward Cummings, Ph. D., of Boston, Mass., read a paper on the "Organization of Labor," followed by an address by Prof. John D. Clark of Columbia University, New York, on "Trusts, or the Centralization of Power."

CLOSING EXERCISES.

Judge THOMAS J. MORRIS.—With the exercises of this evening the National Conference closes its session. It will, after to-night, remain with us only a happy and inspiring memory. It has been a most fortunate Conference. Bright skies, joyful sunlight, have smiled upon our meeting. Many gifted and eloquent men, wise, experienced, consecrated, have brought for us their profoundest and best thought and deepest message. That message, if I have heard aright, has been of joyous good news. It has been a gospel of love and of hope. There has been no discord, there has been no uncertainty, as to the aim for which we are striving. The teaching that we have had has been that, confiding in God's ultimate good purpose, we may all hope for a day when the kingdom of heaven shall rule upon earth. And that is to be through a fuller, better,

wiser understanding of the dispensation of justice, mercy, and love, worship to God and love to man. As I have listened, it has seemed to me that there was no new panacea offered to us, and that, as the poet sang, it is from the old fields cometh all this new corn from year to year. The Conference has been memorable also that we have been happy in the presence of some of the older, saintlier and best beloved of our brethren. It has been a joy to see them face to face, and hear again the words of wisdom and experience. Not to be forgotten, too, are the friendships that have been here made, renewed, and recemented. May all these great happinesses and privileges bear fruit in our hearts and lives!

I will ask Mr. St. John, who opened the meeting of the Conference with such a noble address, to say a few words in closing.

Rev. CHARLES E. ST. JOHN.—I could wish that our presiding officer had been content to let his own gracious words end our Conference; but I have consented to speak, and I always keep my promises when I can.

I trust we all go out from this Conference with a divine restlessness in our hearts, and a diviner purpose in our minds, and a still more divine conviction of the way whereby we are commissioned to reach out toward the thing unto which that restlessness points, and so carry out to the full the splendid purpose that we have here received. We have heard some conflicting opinions presented by keen minds. Our hearts have been wrung by the pictures that have been given to us from day to day of the present evil conditions that exist in the world. Thence comes our restlessness of spirit. We have been told by one and another that there must be more brotherhood in the world, more fraternity between man and man; and from that springs our purpose,—that each and every one of us, by the love of God, will from this day on do more than he has done to make brotherhood real between man and man.

But in the eagerness of our purpose and the greatness of our discontent let us not forget that, as a church of God, we have here listened to things that went deeper than that yearning, deeper than the love of brotherhood. We have heard here a proclamation of the motives which, taking possession of human souls, will compel them to be brotherly, and teach them how to be brotherly. We have been brought into contact with the moving spirit of God, have we not? We have here been enabled to know better than we have known before how near God is to us all, and

how surely it would be impossible for any men to be brothers to each other save through the recognition of their common sonship to God. If we came here with scattered forces, the Conference has missed its aim, unless we come out as a united army to go and carry out the purposes developed in our souls. So let us go out together, under the inspiration of the great things of our faith.

We have been told that science has not proved the reality of God nor the certainty of the life eternal. If it has not, so much the worse for science; for these things are true. We amount to nothing in the world, you and I, for the building up of brotherhood, unless we are competent to give to this world a conviction of the presence of God, whom men can see, in so far as they are pure in heart; and we are incompetent to do our work as a Christian church unless we know that we are immortal souls. [Applause.]

You know the scene that closes Rostand's "Cyrano de Bergerac," in Richard Mansfield's version, wherein that magnificent hero, after his life of self-suppression in the name of friendship and hopeless love, stricken to death by the hands of a hidden enemy, rises, about to die, and looks back over those things that have been immediately before and in the vision of the life that is to come, and in the memory of one great thing that has inspired him long, forgetting the foolish woman who has been so blind during these years,—struggles to his feet, and dies with the words on his lips that he has kept one thing spotless, his snow-white soldier crest.

Let us go out into the world to keep spotless our snow-white soldier crest as we work on in the army of the kingdom of God. Look at the crest that here afresh has been placed upon our helmets, with its plume of the love of God, its plume of brotherhood of man, its plume of the recognition of the dignity of the human soul, its topmost plume of the conviction of the life eternal. Now, comrades, we shall soil that snow-white crest of ours if we go out with criticisms upon our lips of the plumes that stand on other men's crests. We shall soil the beauty of our own conception of the great things of Christ if we stop one second to criticise the beauty of the vision by which other men see God, who is their Father as he is ours. We shall soil the plumes upon our soldier crests if we in any way yield to personal selfishness or unwillingness in the service for which that crest stands. We shall soil it if we think of ourselves and our own advancement. We shall soil it if

we simply are looking for the building of a great organization. We might soil it in a thousand ways; but we shall keep it spotless if each and every one of us determines to live from this time on by the law of self-sacrifice, the law of faithfulness.

Come on with me, comrades. Take me and the others whom you have put into the management of our common work,—take us for your leaders, and come on and work in a way that shall keep the crests of us all spotless. The best thing that you and I can do for the world is, taking all the light that our specialists can give us, to go out and diffuse the light that they give by the persistent love that we bring upon the world. For the things I have spoken of go under all other interpretations of life. They are the basis of human brotherhood. [Applause.]

The hymn "Nearer, my God, to thee," was sung; and the Conference adjourned.

REPORTS.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

BY REV. HOWARD N. BROWN, CHAIRMAN.

The two years which have elapsed since the session of this Conference, in 1899, have been crowded with evidences of a great change that is being brought to pass throughout the religious world. To the churches which this Conference represents these years have brought abundant reasons for satisfaction and thankfulness, together with some occasion for anxiety concerning the way before them. Religious institutions, like the life which they serve, are never entirely free from danger; and the gloomy or hopeless mood always finds sufficient pretext for its fear of disaster.

That the churches which uphold the Unitarian faith are, however, for the most part full of life and health, has been twice proven in the sight of all men since last this Council issued its report. The seventy-fifth annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association, held in Boston during the closing year of the nineteenth century, and the first meeting of the International Council of Liberal Religious Thinkers and Workers, held in London the opening year of the twentieth century, both demonstrated a depth of loyalty to Unitarian convictions and an amount of enthusiasm for their spread, somewhat surprising, perhaps, to most people who took note of these occasions.

For the wonderful success of these two series of meetings we are much indebted to the president of the American Unitarian Association, who chiefly planned the celebration of that seventy-fifth anniversary, and who was so prompt to seize the advantage then offered for the organization of the International Council, first suggested by Prof. Boros of Hungary. All that he could accomplish, however, was to provide opportunity for the display of whatever interest there might be among our churches in the work committed to their care. The strong belief of our people in the gospel as revealed to them, and their ardent desire to make that gospel more widely known, have been again signalized by these remarkable meetings.

The large assemblies which came together in Boston, like those in London, were partly drawn, no doubt, by the

fame of men coming from distant parts of the earth. But the impression made upon visitors from abroad to the birthplace of Unitarianism in America, as expressed by them again and again, was a sense of the great strength and enterprise of our American churches. We scarcely knew we were so much alive until our foreign brethren told us of our remarkably healthy appearance; and some of our traditional hypochondria has disappeared since we received their inspiring testimony.

The London meetings were chiefly significant perhaps for their revelation of Unitarian sentiment and belief, living and working in all the great nations of the Western Europe. The enemies of our faith seem to cling to the idea that it is only one more curious and impractical "Boston notion"; and Bostonians themselves are sometimes suspected of believing that they hold a patent upon the invention of this kind of religion.

But, whenever we meet our brethren from Hungary, we are made to know that our form of Protestantism is as old as any, and dates back to the great Reformation, which was the beginning of all modern liberty. When we listen to the leaders of liberal thought in Germany, we discover that they represent another line of spiritual evolution, which has reached many of the conclusions to which we have arrived, though it has borrowed little from English or American sources. When we come in contact with distinguished students and scholars from France who are there teaching ideas that are dear to us, we feel that they show us what the Huguenot strain of religious life would have grown to be, had it not been almost destroyed by one of the bloodiest persecutions known to history. And to learn that, even in Italy, the home and abiding-place of the greatest priestly tyranny under which mankind has suffered, there are minds which keep alive the seed sown by the so-called Socinian heresy, gives us prophecy and promise of a coming day of intellectual freedom in religion, whose light shall shine into the darkest caves where bigotry and superstition hide themselves.

Our churches have reason to be much encouraged by the showing made on the notable occasions of which we have here made mention. It is safe to say that never did audiences gathered under the Unitarian name listen to a more worthy or more interesting series of addresses, and never did the preaching of our word meet with more earnest and heartfelt response from the mind of the people. Whatever we may have to show or fail to show, by way of

brilliant exception to the common order of preaching talent, our ministry as a whole never spoke to men with more convincing power, and, though the results of their labors may often seem small, it is certain that the effects they produce will be in the end commensurate with whatever spiritual force they possess.

The growing influence and prosperity of our general organizations also gives us the right to be hopeful for the future. Our national Association has made steady gain. The tide of gifts flowing into its treasury slowly, but surely, rises year after year; and this indicates, what one may feel in other ways, that it constantly wins from our people increasing loyalty and confidence. It is always to be remembered that circumstance and inheritance gave our churches, at the start, an exaggerated dread of all forms of denominational management and control. This jealous fear of some curtailment of their congregational liberty rather than any lack of enthusiasm for the advancement of their religious faith, has made them slow and cautious about the construction of an organization through which to do their denominational work; and enough of this feeling still survives to safeguard abundantly the independence of our churches. But, as experience demonstrates the possibility of making such an organization strong for the legitimate purpose of effective co-operation, without serious risk of establishing an ecclesiastical tyranny, the American Unitarian Association gradually secures an enlarged support, and begins to be in some decent measure equipped for the career of usefulness opened before it.

Other organizations, like our Sunday-school Societies, the Women's Alliance and the Young People's Religious Union, have also grown in influence and in power to render effective service to our cause. The organization of our Unitarian women has indeed made almost phenomenal progress, and its Post-office Mission continues to be one of the most remarkable agencies for the diffusion of religious literature ever put in operation. Our Young People's Society is the latest, but by no means the least valuable addition to our institutional life. It has been fortunate in finding officers of energy and discretion to direct its affairs, and gives promise of bringing new vitality to those churches in which its branches have been established. In all these ways Unitarians are learning, year by year, how to increase the scope and add to the effectiveness of their activities.

We have still another reason for the indulgence of some grateful pride as we meet together in this nineteenth session of our National Conference. Time after time the Council Report has dealt with the problem of supplying a proper education for our youth. In many and many an address before our people it has been pointed out what wrong was done to these young minds by sending them, at the most susceptible period of their growth, where they must meet the powerful sectarian influences brought to bear upon them by certain preparatory schools. We do not approve of this kind of religious influence for ourselves; and we ought not to place our sons where they are constantly subjected to it, before they have much ability to weigh and measure its worth.

So long had this problem been discussed in our public meetings, so many committees had been appointed to attempt its solution, and so many fruitless or only partly successful experiments had been made, that most of us, no doubt, had become well-nigh hopeless of finding a way out of the difficulty. This feeling, however, was swiftly changed by the able and eloquent representation made on behalf of the Hackley School in Tarrytown, N. Y., at the last meeting of the Conference in Washington. That school continues to give promise of growth to a position of first rank in point of size and numbers, as it already stands the peer of any in the quality of the discipline which it provides.

The buildings now in process of erection will be insufficient for the demands of the school; and we call attention to the plan to erect an additional dormitory, to be called the Edward Everett Hale House. To secure the $50,000 necessary to build this dormitory, a committee was appointed at the May meetings of the current year. Of this committee Rev. James De Normandie is chairman. We earnestly recommend that the Unitarian people accomplish this object, and thus set forward the Hackley School, and establish in connection with the education of our youth a memorial of the most honored name among us.

There are other schools in perfect accord with Unitarian ideals, whose growing prosperity is due in part, it may be, to the agitation of this question in the past. The list of them may be found in the Unitarian Year Book, but is too long to be given here. Unitarian parents henceforth can have no excuse for intrusting their children to the doubtful mercies of preceptors who feel bound to use every opportunity to secure converts for their particular sect; and, after all that has been said, their duty to support these

schools, whose beginnings the generosity and enterprise of a few have so greatly enriched, can scarcely need to be further emphasized or set forth.

The last Conference expressed its sense of the value of Mr. Douthit's enterprise at Lithia Springs, and recommended to our churches that they should assist him in his plans. A fund has been raised for the purchase of this property; and the purchase has now been completed, the title being placed in the name of the American Unitarian Association. Mr. Douthit is, however, left entirely free in the management of his remarkably successful meetings, which are held there year after year. This enterprise is abundantly worthy of continued encouragement and support, and it is to be hoped that our churches will maintain a steady interest in Mr. Douthit's work.

The only offset worth mentioning to these signs of organic life and strength (the list of which might be considably prolonged) is to be found in the present standing of our denominational literature. The failure of the *New World* to win for itself sufficient financial support to assure its continuance is a distinct loss to our own and to the whole forward movement in religion. Though, in accordance with the plan formed at its beginning, this periodical did not fly any denominational flag, yet it was distinctly a Unitarian undertaking. The money with which the initial venture was made was in part raised by a committee of this Conference, and the rest was contributed by our National Association. Its editorial control remained throughout in Unitarian hands.

It was, while it lived, unquestionably the ablest and best magazine of the kind anywhere published. Its failure is no more discredit to us than to society in general; for it simply proves that the constituency able to appreciate such a publication is not yet large enough, in this country, to provide for its adequate support. We may be glad to learn that the trustees of the Hibbert Fund in England have resolved to establish a magazine which will be virtually the *New World* continued under another name. But we must regret that we cannot yet have such a periodical of our own; and we may hope that toward a final success in this direction the *New World* has done something to prepare the way.

The *Christian Register* still falls short of the circulation which it needs to be entirely self-supporting. Its condition in this respect is not peculiar to itself, but it suffers in common with all denominational papers. The rapid

growth of a few half religious, half secular journals to enormous circulation has been achieved at the expense of all papers of the *Christian Register's* class. The *Congregationalist,* for example, which until recent years has lived prosperously upon its own resources, has now been placed under the control of the denominational publishing house to save it from passing into the hands of outside parties, and is virtually subsidized by denominational funds.

The *Register* is abundantly worthy of entrance to every Unitarian household; and probably not many of us are compelled to choose between a subscription toward its support and our subscription to one of the more popular journals of the day. Most of us could very easily afford to take both. Considering the size of our constituency, the *Register* has already a large circulation as compared with other religious journals; but our situation demands more loyalty than is commonly given to a religious journal, and this duty still needs to be urged upon our people.

There is another way in which we may help the *Register,* and at the same time perform a most important stroke of missionary work. During the past year sufficient funds were put into the hands of its publisher to enable him to send the paper to about eleven hundred orthodox ministers. The letters of gratitude and appreciation that have been received from these men could hardly fail to astonish any one who should read them. There are, to be sure, enough letters of a different sort to show that the year's experiment was by no means a work of supererogation. But, on the whole, an impression has been produced, surprisingly large as measured by the means expended. Unitarians can hardly find a better method for extending the knowledge of their faith than to contribute to this missionary fund of the *Christian Register.* Such contributions will be doubly useful, in that they will also help to solve the problem of continued existence which has come upon the paper in these later days.

One of the questions which still demands serious attention is that of the education of our ministry. Our Theological School at Meadville was never before so well equipped for its purpose, and has received very handsome gifts during the past year toward its further endowment. But it has not the number of students for which accommodations are now provided. Its honored president, after many years of faithful service, has felt constrained to resign the responsibilities of that office. Whether the school under its new president, when he shall be chosen,

can succeed in attracting more young men remains to be seen. Meantime, notwithstanding the advantages offered at both Meadville and Cambridge, our ministry is, for the most part, recruited by those who come to us in mature life from other denominations.

Whether this speaks well or ill for us may be a matter of opinion. Certainly, we can at any time get all the ministers we need by a little encouragement of men who are not entirely content with their present religious fellowship; and we have little reason to find fault with the quality of those whom we have thus far received. But, while we could not wisely desire to have that door closed through which so many of the ablest ministers now in our ranks have come to us, we may well wish to see more young men who belong to us by birth and inheritance coming into our ministry through our own theological schools. The ministers of our churches should do what they can to raise up from the congregations committed to their charge earnest and consecrated preachers of our word.

But, while we are thus able to present on the whole a hopeful and cheerful report of the advance of liberal ideas in religion, the still unmeasured force of that great process of change everywhere at work in the Church of the present day gives all thoughtful observers some feeling of uncertainty about the future. To judge by what lies upon the surface, we have great cause to be hopeful and only a little reason to be apprehensive. It even seems as if the whole Christian world were coming our way, with constantly accelerating pace; and, indeed, the foes as well as the friends of modern thought often say that the drift toward Unitarianism in recent years has been enormous.

Some of the more zealous among us may be inclined to say: "We did it! It is Unitarianism that has leavened the whole orthodox lump!" That, no doubt, would be a foolish claim. The true glory of the people called Unitarian is that they were among the first to feel and respond to the breath of a new spirit that had entered the world. They may also make their boast that, in the face of much bitter prejudice, they have done something to help forward the spiritual emancipation of the Church. But the cause of those effects which become more and more startling in our day is, without doubt, that universal spirit whose comings and goings are much beyond human control.

If we were responsible for that revolt against established creeds which is now invading the peace of every household of faith and carrying so many thousands of people far out-

side the influences of all churches whatever, we might well be somewhat frightened by the outlook. But we have not made all this disturbance, though certain ecclesiastical authorities, who use us as their "bogey-man" to scare the wayward members of their flock, may seem to say so. It is a great world-movement in which we, like all others, are borne along; only we were among the first to be wrenched from our moorings, and we have now grown somewhat accustomed to spiritual latitudes which still seem strange to most Christian souls.

This fact should indicate the great service we may render to the rest of the Christian world. The powerful liberalizing tendencies of the day can appear to minds which so painfully resist them, only as tendencies toward a final goal of absolute atheism and irreligion. No doubt the clearest proof to the contrary would fail to remove these fears entirely; but the patient and steadfast manifestation of a deeply religious spirit, joined with beliefs which are able to command the respect of the modern intellect, must at last produce an impression upon minds which refuse to consider any new truth or new discovery, lest it may somehow imperil their salvation.

Far be it from any of us to boast that we have yet in more than some fractional degree realized the religious possibilities of the truth about God and man that has come into our keeping. But, if we want to help mankind, here is our opportunity; not so much to show them the logical fitness or certainty of our religious views as to convince their reluctant sight that people who hold these ideas have a better clew to the secret of the wondrous life portrayed in the Gospels than can be given by those speculations which have crystallized in the great historic creeds.

At all events, this is the test by which Unitarianism is sure to be tried. It is not courage to shock deliberately the religious sensibilities of our fellow-men, but patience and faithfulness in setting forth and living out the ideals of the new Christianity, which will best enable us to fulfil our mission. We need not belittle that work upon which many are now engaged, and which is spoken of as "the reorganization of Christian faith." But, much more, the practical value of the newer thought in religion will be determined by the quality of life which comes to be associated with it in the public mind. Nothing else can avail so much in the end to banish that fear which forever resists the advance of reason in religion as the living example of a body of churches whose windows are open to every

new truth, and whose influence for every good word and work is thereby not diminished, but increased.

But, suppose our opportunity to lead the way for other great Christian hosts to follow were taken from us! What, then, have we left to live for? There are those who think that Liberal Orthodoxy has now so far assumed the work we were once set to do as to leave us small excuse for continued existence. There are others who think that we have been somewhat too acutely conscious of performing a world-wide mission, and have spent some valuable time in setting right the affairs of our neighbors, when we might have been better employed in assiduous cultivation of our own small vineyard.

But, be this as it may, what might not four hundred churches accomplish in a few generations toward strengthening the higher life of the nation, if only they knew how to make full use of the tools put into their hands? Any established method of co-operation for good ends in this world of ours is unspeakably precious; for, unless it may be under the stress of some all-compelling emergency, such institutions are hard to foster and are slow of growth. And the need of them was never greater than at the present day. The virtuous part of mankind may be growing better, but the wicked part is not showing any increased disposition to amend its ways. On the contrary, the deadliest vices nowhere lift up a bolder head, and nowhere bring to their aid a more devilish ingenuity, than here in free America. For a long time to come this land of ours must be the battle ground of a desperate fight between forces that uplift and forces that destroy the nation's honor and integrity.

And, though by the very law of its being a church is debarred from entrance to that political arena where most of these battles are to be fought out, what is of more consequence than to uphold those great ideals whose presence is the only light that shows a way to better things? What can the Church do more or better than, like a wise and faithful mother, to send forth sons and daughters, whom she has trained and who know how to fight the world's evils, to comfort its sorrows and bind up its wounds? It has been the great glory of our own small Zion in the past that it has furnished so many stout champions of truth and right to every field of charity, philanthrophy and reform. To repeat that triumph in days to come would be honor enough for our churches, though the final verdict of history should accord them no other praise.

But who is sufficient for the mighty tasks which these churches of ours are entreated and commanded to undertake? What an amount of devotion and self-sacrifice they must claim from all their members, old and young, if they continue strong in the faith and practice of the higher righteousness! What profound knowledge of human nature is required on the part of those who would minister to its deepest need? How wisely and carefully the balance must be held between reverence for that past which makes so large a part of the living present and regard for that future which is to outgrow the achievement of former days! What trust we must have in things beyond all proof! What wisdom of common sense we need to save us from foolish and fruitless experiments!

We have not yet learned our lesson. However infallible others may assume to be, let us confess that we are only beginning to know a little of the way in which the redemption of our race from ignorance and iniquity is to be worked out. But there is a way, and it can be learned. He in whose spirit and in whose name the greatest victories of civilization have been won, said, "Greater works than these shall ye do." Little by little we can find out the secret of his power over the inmost souls of men, and by the power of that knowledge we can break those bonds in which Paganism has bound so much of the spiritual energy of his church. Great wonders have been wrought, many times, by men who were only experimenting in the dark. If, then, we can learn to know, in any measure, the ways of the Spirit, we may be sure of the ultimate fulfilment of that glorious dream which really underlies the foundation of every Christian church.

Resolutions offered by Mr. Brown: "By direction of the Council and in its name, I present the following resolutions:

"*Resolved,* That this Conference hereby expresses its sorrow for the untimely death of the late beloved President of this Republic, William McKinley; its admiration for the qualities of mind and heart which had so greatly endeared him to the American people; and its horror of the crime which so wantonly occasioned this great public bereavement.

"*Resolved,* That this Conference hereby expresses its sense of the loss which our Unitarian churches have sustained through the deaths of Hon. Roger Wolcott of Massachusetts and Hon. Dorman B. Eaton of New York. The names and the virtues of these eminent citizens and public servants, who were both vice-presidents of this Conference, have been a source of inspiration to our whole religious fellowship, and their memory will be long cherished among us with grateful pride."

AN ADDRESS BY REV. JOHN P. FORBES,

DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

Ladies and gentlemen of the National Conference: Owing to the unavoidable absence of the president of the American Unitarian Association from this meeting, I, as a director of the Association, have been chosen to present its claims to your interest and support. It is my purpose to set forth, as well as I may in a half hour, the Association's opportunity and needs, the ground of its endeavor and the nature of its demands, on the churches of the Unitarian fellowship.

The American Unitarian Association was founded in 1825 to promote union, sympathy and co-operation among liberal Christians, to publish books and tracts for the diffusion of pure Christianity, to supply missionaries, and to found and maintain Unitarian churches." This work has been carried on with increasing efficiency for seventy-six years. At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, there are those who say that the drift of the time is away from religion, and that the effort to found churches is not only unwise, but an actual waste of time, talent and money. With this position I cannot agree. I do not believe that religion is an outworn sentiment. On the contrary, I believe that the present is a time for the supporters of religious institutions to take courage, to increase their zeal, and to inquire with sincerity and earnestness, What is the demand of the time on religion? It is for us, gathered here to-day, to ask not, How may we bring our denominational affairs to a dignified conclusion and retire from the great endeavor to bring in the kingdom of God on earth? but, What is the interpretation that the time demands of our purpose to diffuse pure Christianity, to promote union, sympathy and co-operation among liberal Christians? Among the cries of the present day are two which rise high and clear above the rest,—the cry for social justice and the cry for religious faith. Whatever may be our opinion as to the relation of the Christian Church to social justice, we must all admit that the function of the Christian Church is to preach, teach, illustrate, and make beautiful religious faith. This is what the Christian

Church is for. And is it not true that the world is calling on the Church and the institutions it fosters to do their duty? An able and powerful writer on present-day conditions of Christian thought and life has said:

*"'This is not 'an age of doubt' in the true religious meaning of the word. It is not an irreligious age, nor a scoffing age. It is a serious, earnest, believing age in its whole spirit. It seeks religious light, and it glows with the fire of religious love and freedom. But as to the old dogmatic traditionalism, that has come down from early Christian days, with all its gathered inheritance of pagan, monkish, mediæval and popish superstitions and beliefs, this age is intensely sceptical. Ask men and women why they have ceased to attend church, and they will tell you that they have ceased to believe much that is preached, and that their religious needs are not ministered to. I wonder whether those who assume to sit in Moses' seat realize with any degree of adequacy the largeness and power of this sceptical revolt."

Observe that the scepticism of which our author speaks challenges ancient theological dogma and not religious faith. Does any one here present really believe that men and women, the great mass of them, are indifferent to a rational and at the same time positive affirmation of the practical value of belief in God; that they are indifferent to "the worth and witness of spiritual life;" that they refuse to be taught that † "over against the prescriptions of materialism and indifference stand the reality and measureless effect of ideal truth"; that their minds are not open to the teaching that religion is a primal and essential element of their being and that faith is as natural as thought? I believe with all my heart that the great need of our time is men, sound of mind and great of heart, to serve as missionaries of religious faith to a waiting world. Many there are who say that practical problems, problems of wise charity and reform, are more exigent and important than the problem of faith. I cannot so believe. Beneath all questions of the relation of man to man is the question of the relation of man to God. First make it clear that

> "Reason's voice and God's,
> Nature's and Duty's never are at odds,"

and then go forward to the solution of social problems. To feel that beneath all the painted shows of life there is a

*Prof. L. L. Paine, "Evolution of Trinitarianism," pp. 179, 180.
†Sermon by Prof. F. G. Peabody.

creative spirit, to feel that truth, justice, love, are not speculations of the philosopher's mind, but are eternal realities, grounded in the nature of an infinite God,—this is the real, although not always expressed, demand of thousands in our time. And this demand constitutes the opportunity of religious organizations; it constitutes the opportunity of our Association. Notice that the demand inevitably lays tremendous emphasis on the missionary spirit and effort. It calls us to be rational and careful, but at the same time to be enthusiastic and hopeful. We must let wisdom guide our steps, but we must also be sure that consecration to a great work is the incentive of our endeavor. If we have done much in the past, we must do more now. If we have been faithful in diffusing pure Christianity in other days, we must continue that faithfulness in the present day. "There is no discharge in that war."

Just here we are confronted by an obstacle to the acceptance and use of our opportunity; namely, the problem of the administration of our communion. This is precisely the problem which confronts every democracy, whether religious or practical,—the problem of uniting pure democracy and practical efficiency. I assume that all within sound of my voice are by conviction believers in the principles of Congregationalism, just as they are by conviction believers in democratic principles and ideals; but we must all confess that thus far these principles have not been able to evolve a working efficiency which can for a moment compare with the efficiency of the great ecclesiastical corporations. Is not the present time a time to prove that a religious democracy can be an efficient working power? Our president writes: "I long for greater fidelity on the part of our people to the Association and its purposes; for it has an honorable record, and has been and always must be our main reliance for efficiency. Shall not the institution itself command a heartier and stronger support, regardless of those who are for the present time concerned in its administration?" What answer shall we make to his question?

"But," some one may ask, "is not the spiritual vitalizing of our churches a work which above all else needs to be accomplished?" Yes, no doubt; and this is a matter about which the present administration of the Association is deeply concerned. As has been said, "The increase of religious dynamic is our first essential." We do not want the letter without the spirit, the body without the soul;

but we do want efficient, practical, organized service of the soul in the body. Narrow views, selfish aims, stolid conservatism, are never to be taken as evidence of spiritual vitality. We must beware, also, of a lazy indifference to what are called "mere external matters," which not seldom passes among us as evidence of a deep, calm, spiritual life. Many, doubtless, have heard the anecdote Dr. Bellows was fond of telling about a man who had a beautiful Christian character, but was probably the laziest man in town. He had correct views, he uttered beautiful sentiments; but he did not work. It is the spiritual life that gives evidence of real power by bringing forth "the fruits of the spirit," in the most practical, business-like way, that can alone sustain the church in the modern world. Refined and gentle theorizing does not meet the need of the hour. Let us have closer organization for religious service.

We now pass to a consideration of some of the practical needs of the Association. The first of these is the need of personal interest and ungrudging service, the word of intelligent appreciation, the wise counsel, the "helping hand," which may supply courage and vigor for unceasing endeavor,—a need which every person in this audience may help to meet.

The second need is closely related to the first. It is the need of generous and prompt financial support to enable the Association to publish more books and tracts, to supply more missionaries, to found and maintain more Unitarian churches, to do more efficient work in college towns, to enter the field of service opened to Unitarians among the foreign populations in America and American dependencies, to carry forward the educational work so auspiciously begun at Hackley Hall, to enter into cordial and more sympathetic communion with the fellow-workers in other nations,—a movement happily inaugurated by the International Council recently held in London. These needs have been carefully analyzed and their urgency made clear by our officers in their printed reports, and more especially in a tract called "Some Unitarian Opportunities." All these publications I beg you to procure and read.

Now I wish to emphasize a single need which concerns the Association as the working arm of our communion; namely, the religious education of our children. I am continually meeting young men and women who confess that their parents, nominally of the Unitarian household, never talked with them on religious subjects, never sought to

make them familiar with the principles of our faith, never gave them any information about our form of church government or about our single missionary organization. And what is the result? These young people are, on the whole, well disposed toward our faith, but are not vitally interested in its prosperity, are not prepared to make sacrifices for it, do not consider it as important as business or politics. At twenty, twenty-five, or thirty years of age they ask, "What does Unitarianism stand for?" They say: "The American Unitarian Association! Oh, yes, that institution exists for the purpose of supplying the churches with ministers." As if ministers were some variety of fruit to be plucked from trees and shipped off to market with the label attached, "To be eaten without delay, before decay sets in." What are we to expect from such results? Why, the condition of the church of Sardis, to which came the message of rebuke and condemnation, "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead!"

There is heard a cry for the reënforcement of our ministry by our own earnest, devout, and well-trained young men. One of the Association's officers recently wrote me, "If you can say a good strong word for the profession, you will strike right at the critical point of our life and work." If I were to present the claims of the Christian ministry to a young man, I should not speak from the commercial point of view. I should not urge the argument that it is a gentlemanly thing to enter the profession. Here, I should say, is an opportunity to do an honorable and useful work in the world. You may preach a gospel of the Divine Fatherhood, of salvation from a sinful life by the development of character, of human helpfulness in a world where care and trouble attend every step of experience. You may cherish ideal purposes and aims; you may give yourself in a ministry of pure self-sacrifice and ungrudging service. If you are strong in body, thoroughly educated and believe with all your heart that the concerns of religion are the highest concerns that can engage the interest of a human soul, join "the brotherhood" and share its high endeavor. Be sure of yourself, then *come!* I have not found young men always indifferent to this appeal. But let me ask, What hope can there be for our ministry, what hope can there be for our cause, if our children are denied the right of religious education in the home, if they know nothing of our Unitarian history and principles, nothing of the noble heritage which has come to us from the fathers, if they are not taught that their Unitarian faith rightfully

claims the best they have to give? Parents who hear me, do not so fail in the training of your children that the last sacrifice they would think of making is a sacrifice for their faith, that the last calling they would think of choosing is the Christian ministry in the Unitarian fellowship.

The Association's needs indicate the nature of its demand on the churches. Some one has said, "The measure of the Association's efficiency is simply the measure of the confidence and aid of its friends." The statement is profoundly true. Thus I am brought to the word I would make the keynote of my address this morning,—*Loyalty*. As I use this word, I am thinking, not of those who are asking about the advisability of profit, the wisdom of glory, of becoming upholders of liberal Christianity. Rather am I thinking of those who *are*, by conviction and sentiment, liberal Christians. We are all stirred by the loyalty of the man who has given himself to a cause, has enlisted for a campaign, and is ready to obey the orders for the day, "be they to march and fight or stand and wait." The great question is, not What is my personal preference; but What does the cause demand at my hands? Men may come and men may go, but the cause remains.

Now and again we hear it said, "Our gospel is not adapted to the needs of the great mass of men: only the cultured and refined can appreciate our message." My answer is, If our gospel presents the great, universal truths of religion, it is a gospel for all mankind. If our preaching and teaching of our gospel are not convincing, persuasive, helpful, our clear duty is to change our methods of preaching and teaching. Let us not judge our gospel by its inferior limit. Let us provide it with a better form of expression.

There are others who say, "Liberal Orthodoxy is doing our work for us." Is the statement true? Does Liberal Orthodoxy repudiate every form, no matter how attenuated, of the doctrine of the Trinity? Does it accept, without qualification or reservation, the strict humanity of Jesus of Nazareth? Does it throw aside the dogma of a ruined human nature? Is it true that any form of orthodoxy, however liberal, is appealing to men with the Unitarian gospel?

Approach the matter from another point of view. Shall we say that one individual or organization can do the work of another individual or organization? No man can assume my responsibility or bear my burden. When my duty is neglected, I am the man. So no other body of

Christians can do our work for us. Some other body may do a work similar to ours, or it may try to do a work that we leave undone. Is that a reason, however, why we should shirk our responsibility? Can it be that some among us have not enlisted for the campaign, are not ready to obey the orders for the day?

It is for us of the Unitarian faith cheerfully, loyally, to go our way, unmindful of other communions, save as we observe the requirements of a rational and helpful co-operation for holiness. I appeal to the honorable and venerable preachers of our faith on this platform to-day, I appeal to all the members of the "brotherhood" before me,—are you not stirred to the performance of whatever efficient service you give the world by a loyalty to your Unitarian faith strong enough to overcome all obstacles in the present and make you hopeful for the future? I appeal to this gathering of Unitarian men and women,—shall we not to-day pledge ourselves to a more consistent, self-denying loyalty to the gospel we profess and to the Association which is that gospel's missionary agent?

Ladies and gentlemen, I have tried to make clear to you the opportunity and the needs of the American Unitarian Association,—the ground of its endeavor, and the nature of its demand on the churches of our fellowship,—as I understand them. You call the Association your "executive right arm." But remember the right arm cannot be strong unless it is fed by the sound heart. You are the heart, the source of life and power, from which the Association must draw its support. Therefore, I ask you to appreciate its opportunity, to supply its needs, to be, in thought and act, its loyal friends and supporters.

ESSAYS AND DISCUSSIONS.

A CENTURY'S RETROSPECT.

BY REV. CHARLES G. AMES.

I am instructed by the despotic powers which make the wheels of this Conference go round to occupy your attention for a half hour with a Retrospect of Unitarianism in the Nineteenth Century. It is a shrewd bit of stage management which will serve to set off, by contrast, the prophetic address which is to come next, and from those wiser lips which have taught us to "look forward, and not backward." One of us is to lay on the wood: the other is to bring down the fire from heaven.

Among the notable phases of life in the nineteenth century there has been a spiritual development which may as well be called the Unitarian movement. Not because it can be measured or monopolized by the little group of churches that wear that name; not because they have any business to brand it with their trade-mark, but because they are its best defined and most conspicuous product, and because also this movement represents the same strong and wide stream of tendency which has carried them along.

This movement has affected in varying degree all churches and sects. It has gone far to give new shape and color to private and public life, to literature, art and politics, as well as to theology and ethics. It has set up new standards of conduct and created new types of character. These churches are its index and illustration.

A hundred years ago Unitarianism was visible in America only as a mustard-seed. In 1776, King's Chapel, in Boston, had expunged the Trinitarian clauses from its liturgy; and in 1795 a little pastorless company had been gathered in Philadelphia by Dr. Priestley. That was all, save the searchings of heart that were going on inside the Calvinistic mind of New England.

Channing came to the Federal Street pulpit in 1803,—the small beginning of a great era. The clear, steady shining of his star was a presage to more than he could foresee. His own strong and bold pronunciamentos helped make inevitable the very denominationalism he dreaded. Yet, when the American Unitarian Association was organized

in 1825, Christendom gave the event hardly more attention than the Roman world of Cæsar Augustus gave to the feeble cry of one more new-born Hebrew child in Palestine. A hundred and twenty churches had been pushed out of the old New England "faith and order"; but heresies and schisms are no novelties in ecclesiastical history. "They will have their day, and cease to be," said the complacent regulars. Meanwhile the liberals were torn by their own dissensions; or shall I say they were tortured by growing pains? The heated debates which followed Emerson's Divinity School address in 1838, Parker's South Boston sermon in 1841, the battle of Syracuse in 1866, and the Western issue in the eighties, must all have seemed to the great evangelical churches like those troubles in wicked hearts which continually "cast up mire and dirt." Was not the organization of this Conference in 1865 noted chiefly as a stir in the camp of the religious anarchists of the time?

Indeed, it was not till 1894, when the Unitarians were inspired to glorify God and man with one heart and one mouth, that they came deeply to realize—if they have yet duly realized—their high calling to a place among the embodied and ordered forces of the religious world. Since then they have cared less what others might say, and more what they themselves might be and become and do. The end of the century has found us busy in drilling, mobilizing and directing our forces, in hope to bear a worthy part in winning the victories of truth and righteousness and establishing the kingdom of light and love on earth, as it is in heaven.

I might spend the time in tracing the century's development of Unitarianism,—its embryology, infancy, adolescence and maturity,—a series of changes as distinct as the phases of the moon; I might tell the story of internal conflict and strenuous discussion over matters which now seem ludicrously small; I might show how our scattered and jealously independent congregations have been drawn together in a happy fellowship of faith and love and work. It would make a lively story, but hardly a new one; and there are other things worth saying. And how many good things there is no time for! It would not be profitable, even if it were possible, to consider the Unitarian movement apart from the general conditions of the age: we need to see it as part of a larger whole, as the outcome of causes wider and deeper than itself, and as one contribution to a result vaster than itself,—one item in a world-programme.

The rise of Unitarianism was at first a testimony to the incompleteness of the Protestant Reformation: it formulated the real issue between Rome and Reason. It seems not to have occurred to the professed successors of the apostles over there that, if God could be trusted to teach, man could be trusted to learn. The Reformers made a brave resistance to the papal usurpation; but they worshipped the half-gods of book and creed. So long as honest free thinking was under ban, religion could only make men cowards. There were more fetters to break. It had become necessary to challenge all the alleged authorities,—to challenge them all the more explicitly when they professed to speak in the name of God; and to distrust and discredit such as could give no satisfactory account of themselves.

For the unsettled and troubled state of religious belief during the past century, the Unitarians must accept their full share of the blame—or the praise. Having vindicated the right and urged the duty of free thinking, they threw wide open the doors for both truth and error to come in or go out.

An intelligent man, who made a long visit to Europe, resolved to employ his leisure in carefully re-examining the grounds of his orthodoxy. He wrote me, "Any one who ventures on such an inquiry will not come out where he went in." It is safe to say that the Christian mind of the nineteenth century did not come out where it went in.

The Unitarians themselves were no exceptions. At first they held as stoutly as the orthodox to the old supernaturalism which found no sure sign of divine manifestation outside of miracle, prophecy and verbal inspiration. They defended their doctrines by the old strategy, protecting themselves behind a breastwork bristling with proof-texts. Many a conservative countenance in the Federal Street congregation must have looked like an exclamation point when Channing said that "Jesus came not to shut us up in a book, but to open the universe as the school of our spiritual education. . . . We cannot comprehend God aright if we do not go beyond revelation, and learn in religion from all that we observe." The conceded right "to learn in religion from all that we observe" has been one of the greatest gains of the century.

In emphasizing their own right of dissent from the Calvinistic standards and in claiming that reason must be the judge of revelation, the Unitarians committed themselves to a principle which was destined to transform all their

religious thinking. They unconsciously lifted the anchor which held them to the shallow moorings of historic authority, and soon found themselves sailing the deep seas with God.

There was some repetition of the terror felt by the seamen of Columbus, when for many days and nights they found themselves out of sight of land, with strange constellations scaring them from the sky. But none of us are now disturbed by the fact that not one aspect of divinity, humanity, Christology, exegesis, religious life, or public duty, appears to us as it did to our grandfathers. We ought, indeed, to occupy a little higher ground, standing on their graves:

"For I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns."

Here is the point of view for our Retrospect. We are reading a chapter of evolution,—another name for the larger Bible. As all the long past has been a preparation for all the long future, so the nineteenth century has been a preparation for the twentieth. In religion, as in civilization, there are steps and stages; there is a parliamentary order of proceeding.

Frame houses were impossible till men had invented tools for cutting timber; the tools were impossible till metals could be smelted and fashioned; metallurgy had to wait till Prometheus brought down the fire.

The religious work of the nineteenth century was largely what the Hebrews would have called "preparing the way of the Lord": it was a clearing away of rubbish, the opening of a highway along which the human procession might move

"On to the bounds of the desert,
On to the City of God."

The religious nature of man was partly tangled and strangled in the jungle of its own luxuriant overgrowths,—its by-products of doctrine, tradition, ritual, organization and literature: it was necessary to liberate, simplify and reconstruct,—to destroy in order to fulfil. It was necessary to unload impedimenta; for religion's own sake, it was necessary to get rid of much that passed under its name. It was necessary to recover the simplicity of nature. What does man need but to be alive and well? What use has the Father for His child but to make him heir of all things?

We can still apply the saying of Lessing: "This is not

an enlightened age: it is an age becoming enlightened." But it is impossible to measure the vast breadths of light which have been streaming over large parts of Christendom during the last hundred years. The old theology was like a perpetual eclipse of the sun. An awful shadow darkened heaven and earth.

Pollok wrote without rebuke that "God grew dark with wrath." Calvinism had obscured and perverted into a threat the sweet gospel truth that the main thing which God sees in man is not his sin, but his sonship; that in the worst man He sees His own child; diseased and self-imprisoned it may be, but still and forever an object of infinite love.

In 1800, outside of a few brave Universalists, despised and detested, there was not a preacher who dared to say with full breath, "His mercy endureth forever"; though, as Parker said later, the Universalists were the only people who taught immortality in such a form that one could wish it to be true. And they had not yet thought their own glorious faith clear of the absurd idea of "death and glory."

The heavens and earth of the old spiritual order pass away; but the Christ-message of God's Fatherhood and Man's Sonship climbs and shines like the morning sun. Any conception of God which does not contain these elements, supplied by Jesus, is becoming as impossible to philosophy as to faith. Incarnation or immanence is accepted as the rule, and not as the exception. So, being dead, our prophets still speak.

"All minds are of one family," says Channing.

"Man learns to conceive the worship of God only through human relations," says Andrew Peabody.

"Conscience represents, not the divine frown, but the divine love," says Starr King.

"God, having made the soul for goodness, is educating it for goodness," says Freeman Clarke.

"There is a religious faculty in man and God is its object," says Parker.

"There is one word greater than Religion, that is Humanity," says Hedge.

And Bellows—with a voice as of many waters—glories in "the unsectarian sect," which represents "the unitary sweep of all things human into relation with all things divine."

Not all Unitarian preaching has been equally clear, vital, coherent and ringing; but great voices like these have been

sounding through the century. And how many have set the high faith and hope to music! The air still vibrates to the symphony-notes of Bryant, Longfellow, Emerson, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, and a whole forest of singing birds.

But all these were pioneers. No one has claimed that his message was final, God having still provided for better things to come. The forerunners secured a readier and wider hearing for others, who in the later years of the century have not been disobedient to the ever-clearing vision. For from all quarters of the universe reports have been coming in: more light has been breaking from the unprisoned written word, from the gathered treasures of human experience, from the comparative studies of religion, from profounder researches into the worlds of matter and mind, from the busy teachings of that spirit which leads into all truth only that it may lead into all good, and through that thin, translucent veil which never wholly hides the Infinite from the finite. Yes, "it is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

The age has been deeply stirred by two noble and fruitful motives,—the passion for reality and the enthusiasm of humanity, the love of truth and the love of mankind. Both these principles are at the heart of the modern movement as they were at the heart of Jesus.

The first—the love of truth—has compelled all honest men to distinguish between their traditions and their convictions. It has given vitality to science, and made it a means of grace. It has made the higher order of fiction truer than history. And it has anointed the critical faculty to a holy priesthood which must bear the sacred vessels with clean hands. The Strong One has again appeared among us with his winnowing fan, driving away great clouds of chaff and garnering the wheat for breadstuff and for the seed of many a future harvest.

The second—the enthusiasm of humanity—has swept slavery from Christendom, has multiplied the agencies of education and beneficence, and has inspired millions with the faith that nothing on earth or in heaven is too good for the least of these our brethren. It has softened the animosities of sect and party; it has compelled the fortunate and prosperous to acknowledge their stewardship and their responsibility for the common welfare. And on many an issue of social justice it may have made us almost too urgent for the previous question.

"Charity" has been a very common noun for ages, but

"philanthropy" is a modern word; "international" is a recent coinage; "the solidarity of the race" and "the perfectibility of man" are phrases which must still be explained. And the days are not far back when any talk of the dignity of human nature seemed like a signal for revolt against the Supreme Power.

President Eliot remarks that only for about a century has democracy been an effective working force. Coincident with the social process of levelling upward and with the people's gathering sense of power, there has been a rapid growth of that common respect of men for each other which Dr. Furness identified with practical Christianity. "What! strike a man?" exclaimed Channing; and flogging disappeared from the navy, The treatment of men as brutes still goes on; but humanity has developed a sensitive nerve structure which shudders as never before at any wrong done to the humblest human being, of whatever race or clime.

One result appears in the growing protest against abuses of power and monopolies of advantage. All profitable *inequities* and despotisms, big and little, die hard; but the battle is more than half gained when they are put on the defensive. The spirit of the new time makes altruistic service a fashion, and almost a fad: it bids us call no man master, and it makes us ashamed to be called masters. Educated and official persons feel obliged to announce themselves as public servants.

No ecclesiastical palings can shut out the all-pervading atmosphere. The most stuffy and smothering churchmanship must catch now and then a whiff of the winds of heaven. Independency invades all churches. Presbyter, bishop, archbishop and pope must reckon with the constituency and conjure with the name of "liberal." Even our Roman Catholic brethren are half-consciously charmed with the idea of a "free church in a free state." The most foolish "popular noises" are significant, and are treated with respect. The lay element—vast and turbulent—is qualifying itself for the exercise of its conscious power: it is learning wisdom from its own damaging blunders.

But this democratic flame does not yet burn clear: it does not consume its own smoke. We believe it is a fire from heaven; but we cannot blame those who suspect a different origin. The needless and wasteful conflicts between capital and labor, the clash and plutocratic arrogance with proletarian violence, the popularity of mili-

tary men, and the centralization of power made necessary by imperial policies, the foolish attempts to counteract lawlessness by more lawlessness, and the not less foolish disposition to depend on brute force or legislation to do the work of moral reform, all show how slowly we learn the angel-song of peace and good will.

But the leaven of divine love is slowly spreading through the huge human lump; and probably there was never a time when the spirit of caste or social exclusiveness appeared so vulgar, when war was felt to be so brutal and senseless, and when the degradation of any human being was so painful to contemplate as now. Despite all wrongs and shames, the nineteenth century was a seed-plot of brotherhood; and the harvest is on the way.

The twentieth century begins with one costly advantage left by its predecessor. The moral situation has been uncovered. The forces of good and evil are manifest; and the battle has been put in array.

We can measure "the vast glooms of woe and sin," the weltering masses of greed, sensuality, and violence, and the dull inertia or indifferentism which is still more difficult to reach. We know that "man's inhumanity to man makes countless millions mourn." We know that no government can be trusted to apply the Golden Rule to national or international affairs. We must still repeat Kossuth's complaint that "there is not yet a Christian nation." We know, too, that all the churches, including our own, are not only behind the times, but more or less compromised by existing evils.

But we know something better and more to the purpose. We know that "they that are for us are more than all that can be against us." We know that one ray of light is more than a match for a world of darkness. We know that one throb of heavenly life means more than the deepest slumber of death. We know that the infinite and eternal Energy wakes while we sleep and works through our weakness.

Knowing these things, we know our place and our duty. Despite humiliating deficiencies and failures, we have been honored with a large and handsome part in the historic gains of the century. It has been given to our prophets, seers, and sages to utter living oracles for the guidance and illumination of mankind. It has been given to our little group of churches to rear a large proportion of the men and women who have furnished life-sized illustrations of beautiful character and bountiful service.

It is not to our reproach that we have been a school quite as much as a church. The century was full of churches, there was need of a school; and the Unitarians did not make their place,—it was appointed for them. It is not wholly a disadvantage that we are few in number: a small body can the more easily put itself in motion; and the King's highway is open and free to all. It is a good time to read the story of Gideon and his three hundred,—the legend which tells how one could chase a thousand and two put ten thousand to flight.

The present sums up all the past, and the situation rightly understood is at once a revelation and a command.

"Louder than thunder of summer's loud shower,
On the dome of the sky God is striking the hour."
"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;
He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment-seat;
Be swift our souls to answer Him, be jubilant our feet."

A RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT.

BY REV. E. E. HALE, D.D.

We have white paper to write upon. We have Infinite Power to work withal. If I were addressing clergymen and were using a professional figure, I should say there was no dust in the pulpit cushions. This all means that, as the new century begins, we may forget the things that are behind and reach forward to those that are before. This was good counsel given eighteen hundred and forty or more years ago, and we have not got round to it till now. Now we can take this counsel, and begin again.

I say, we have Infinite Power to work withal. The last century has been piling up resources of physical power such as we are not yet accustomed to. But we know now that we have it, and we know who it is who controls. Speaking roughly, and yet definitely accurate enough for our purpose, the physical power of the average man in any centre of the United States is, in 1901, one thousand times as great as his grandfather had in 1801. The power developed by the steam-engine of the ship which goes from New York to Liverpool in six days is greater than all the power which Cheops used in building the Great Pyramid; and if, when Napoleon had been in Egypt in 1799, he had set out to build a pyramid, he could have brought to bear in a single day no more power than Cheops had at command. Take the mere matter of steam. There were five steam-engines in the United States in the year 1801. Within a mile of me as I stand to-day, man has at command far more resource than that of this one only unconscious power of nature.

Now who is it who controls this power? It is wholly under the control of the moral forces. The moral forces are swayed by God and his children, or, if you prefer to put it so, by the children and their father. I like to say with perfect reverence what perhaps is not said enough, that the direction of what is called the power of nature, of what I called just now the unconscious power of nature, is all in the family,—the father and the child, the child and the father. And if every day, when you and I say, Our

Father who art in heaven, if we mean anything, and if we say what we mean, we are claiming, as the Bible says, to partake of the nature of God; we are claiming, as the Bible says, that we are made in his image; we are claiming, as Saint Paul says, that we walk in the Holy Spirit; we are claiming, as the Saviour says, that it is the Spirit of God who puts into our mouth the words that we say, he gives to our hands the success with which they work. I should like to say, without trespassing farther on the ground which our friend Doctor Ames has made so new and real to us,—I should like to say that the universal discovery of this last century of the immanent presence of God has revealed to man all his own omnipotence, if only he chooses to use the almightiness of God. We are quite familiar with the statement that, because we are children of God we must be eternal as he is. Saint Paul says, and the nineteenth century has proved, that, if we choose to work with him, if we choose to will and to do of his good pleasure, God works with us and gives us complete power to carry through his aims.

It is true that we cannot say in a given instance how much of the work is his and how much is the work of his children; but I do not see that we want to say, I do not know why we should want to say. As I had occasion to say the other day, here is Mozart, the father, who has prepared the score of the music which Mozart, the son, is to perform. The little boy rises gladly to the task, the glad father listens with pleasure to the exquisite music. Whose work is it? Is it the father's? Is it the child's? It is the father working with the child; it is the child working with the father. Here in a single statement of what half of us have seen in our own households in the last week is the statement of the Infinite Power lent, if you please, by God to his children; given, if you please, by God to his children; inherited, if you choose to use that word there,—take what word you please,—shared by the father and the child, if only the child choose to go to work with God, or, as the Scripture says, to enter into his purpose, if he wish to bring in the reign of God, if he wish that the kingdom of heaven may come.

Now, if he really believe that the kingdom of God is at hand, if he really believe that the reign of God is here waiting to control the world, man will join with the Father; and, as Mr. Ames has been showing us, and as we have been growing to know in the last half of the great century, the pathway is at last clear, the valleys are raised

and the mountains hewed down, so that the kingdom of God may come.

The questions are but trivial. The questions of questions for us here are, *if* we mean to bring it in, *when* we mean to bring it in, and to *which* part of the work will we first devote ourselves. Just as DeWitt Clinton has Lake Erie to unite with the Hudson or the Hudson to unite with Lake Erie. Where shall he begin? At Syracuse, at Utica, at Rochester? These are bits of mere local pride, a little incident of history which will be forgotten. What is necessary is that he and his shall begin somewhere. And then, when the barge from the Hudson floats into the basin at Lake Erie, or when the food from Lake Erie feeds the hungry of England, why, men forget, and quite naturally forget who struck the first spade blow and where it was driven.

I will not hold you long in saying what I want to say as to these three days when you are together. Dr. Hedge said in the beginning that this Conference exists to reveal the Unitarian Church to itself. I think this is true. If in three days we can find out what we are for in the first generation of the new century, that will be worth something. If then we can go home and set about doing the work we are for, that will be a great deal. I might say that will be everything. The question is not one of the counting of heads. It makes little difference in history what are the numbers of those who met at the first communion table, or in the upper chamber at Jerusalem, or on the day of Pentecost in a great throng, or how many landed on Plymouth Rock and how many signed the Declaration of Independence,—twelve men, one hundred and twenty or thirty sea-sick families gathering to dig postholes on the sands above Plymouth. It makes no difference whether there are ten or ten thousand; the question is whether they do the thing they are sent to do. As we have seen and as Dr. Ames has said so well, the roadway is open.

And the answer, as I have said, has been ready for nineteen hundred years; but—let me again borrow one of our bold New England phrases—we have not got round to the answer until now. If I were asked to make this speech in sixteen words, I should say that the time of the ecclesiastics is over, and the time for everybody to work has begun.

The instruction given by the first authority at the most critical moment of history and at the most distinguished

place in the world,—the instruction is plain enough; for on the mountain above the lake, in the moment when ancient history ends and modern history begins, Jesus Christ said, "Seek first the kingdom of God." He said that all things should be added to people who made that choice. And in every physical experiment what he then said has proved true. As Dr. Ames has said, The world has been cleared of the rubbish, it has been dug to the foundations, it has been brushing away with its dust-cloth the bacteria and bacilli of ecclesiasticism, of ritualism, of dogmatic theology and other remnants of paganism; and now there stands clear before us the crisis and the question which stood before Israel in the desert, which stood before Israel so often afterward, who wants the reign of God, who wants to work with God, who wants to seek the kingdom of God, first, first, first, and not second, third, or last. So far as I see, this address is made to individuals as it is to churches, to churches as it is to States, the same demand made upon each and all, to John or to Mary, to A, B, C, in the directory, to the government of the United States, to the Emperor of Russia, to the Unitarian Association, to the Unitarian Conference,—the instruction is that we seek the kingdom of God first. To any given church, as a Christian organization, the injunction is not that you shall have a decorous Sunday service at half past ten and in the evening a music service or a forward movement for an hour and three-quarters, and forget the rest of the time that you are a church, but that for the only object of the existence of that church you shall have the coming in of the kingdom of God standing evident before all eyes. The injunction is that for the individual, as he rises from bed, thanks God for light, and washes his face in the morning, the first question shall be, How can I serve the living God to-day, how can I bring in his kingdom? Given this wish on the part of the church or the individual, it is now absolutely certain that the man works with God and God means to put him through. Two or three hundred million people, more or less, prayed God yesterday morning that this world might be fed. God chooses to answer that prayer, and so through this yesterday and to-day he and his children work together. The harvest from last winter and this summer is piled up in the elevators, and long trains are running from the West to the East. The steamers are filling at Duluth, at Chicago, at New York, at Boston, that the food may be sent which is to be eaten in London, by the Boers in the concentrado

camps, in the shape of hardtack in Manila, in answer to this prayer for daily bread. Millions of men are at work with the one God, the one God is at work with millions of men; and as the sun goes down to-night, and those people say again, "Give us day by day our daily bread," the God who works with his children has answered their petition of yesterday.

That is a very small illustration, but it will answer. It will show what will happen when, with a like earnestness, men, churches, and States unite in bringing in the kingdom of God in all the affairs of this world that his will may be done on earth as it is done in heaven, and for this the time is ready. The world is ready for the union of the nations, so that every man may find his own place. If Alabama does not want the black man, the black man shall have a home, perhaps, on the upper waters of the Paraguay River. If the people on the Upper Congo need Tom Osborne's reapers or Oliver Ames's shovels, the freight train between Cairo and the Cape shall have a branch to give them what they need. If the peasant of Bohemia wants to build a new home where there shall be no smoke and dust between his cabin and God's blue sky, he shall choose his home in Southern Siberia, if he prefer it, or in the tableland of Mexico, if he want it. He shall go east or he shall go west. For this shall the nations of the world unite. Nation shall not make war against nation; the sword shall be beat into a ploughshare, and the spear into a pruning-hook. All this means that you and I, the black man who is picking cotton, John Pierpont Morgan who is making rails, shall do something about it, —shall do something about the coming of the kingdom of God. It means that the dullest crowd in the lower wards of New York and the First Congregational Church of Cranberry Centre and the Mutual Improvement Society of boys at the McKinley Four Corners in North Dakota shall do something about it. It means that a Conference like this shall not be satisfied with discussing the little questions of theology or the details of the ecclesiastical religion. It means that the religious business of the next century is for all men and all women, not for the clergy or the sextons or the monks or any other professionals. This Conference must make the ploughboy in Dakota, the engine-driver in the valley of the Mohawk, the look-out on the steamer's deck, and the bootblack in the streets of New York,—it must make them all understand that they are all in God's work and that he needs them

to-day. For once the work of the State and the Church is the same; the work of the layman and the priest is the same; the work of the men and the women is the same. The order of the day is for what they call in the German army the rising of the *Landstrum*, which means the rising of the people. They borrow it from the time when the whole nation, if it chose, marched from the mouth of the Elbe to the fertile fields of Lombardy. We are well rid of the antagonism of the past. We stand looking out from the mountains through whose cañons we have been creeping upon the broad Pacific of the new century. For these endeavors we are promised omnipotent power on one condition. If we seek the Lord our God, we shall find him,—if we seek for him with all our heart and mind and soul and strength. And this condition means that as his children we shall not be satisfied with the foolish chatter of monkeys and crickets. The man of action is greater than the man of talk. We shall determine to do his work, to seek his kingdom first, then the things will be added,—the copper mines and the gold reefs and the iron and the steel and the butter and the bread will be added to the Church or the State or the world which seeks first the reign of God and the righteousness of God.

THE CHURCH AT WORK.

BY REV. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE.

The church at work and the church at worship are one and the same thing, for to labor is to pray. "Work is worship." The church that does not worship has no power or motive to work. The church that does not work has no incentive or ground for worship. It is as if one should go up some beautiful stream and at the mouth of it find a grist-mill with its water wheel, and, further up, away up on the mountains, the tiny stream with the rainbow o'er it. As a matter of fact, it is the rainbow that grinds the corn; and, if it were possible to draw up the mists and dissipate the rainbow, it would be a question of only a little while before that wheel would stop. The church which does not have the springs of its life up in the invisible mountains of God will soon find not only its grist small, but its power low.

But in thinking of the church, particularly in its specific relation of work, we may think of it again either as working with individuals in matters of philanthropy and of charity or we may think of the church in its larger and multiform relationship of dealing with mankind at large. In the first of these relations the church as a corporation, with a *soul*, does not differ in its relation to the individual from the man with a soul; but the church in its relation to society stands in entirely a different relation, and it is into that relation that I would like to direct your thoughts for a little while.

The question that naturally suggests itself to the mind is a perfectly simple one, but really one full of suggestions: the church, in dealing with society, is it dealing with simple individual entities, simply dealing as man to man, only in a wholesale way, or is society an entity, almost a personality by itself? If this latter, then how does it differ from a man's dealing with a man? Until recently we have been left quite in the dark in this matter, because no one man perhaps has had experience enough in the direction of any church to solve the problem for us. But, while our last census was being taken, there was also another kind of census being taken, which was even more sig-

nificant, particularly to those who are interested in the church at work. The question was submitted to statesmen, to orators, to psychologists,—though they were in the minority,—and particularly to actors; in fact, to all that large class of people who have to deal with congregations, with societies as such. This question was submitted to them: "As you are dealing with people, in congregations and societies, do you find that society is made up of individual units or do you find that society is itself a unit?"

The answers show many differences; but they all agree in this: that the aggregate mind—for that is the rather formidable name by which we are now called—is entirely different from the individual mind; that we people who have come into this hall are not the same people that we were when we were on the street. Something has taken place. Now this answer, so far as it goes,—we will examine it further as we proceed,—this answer is all the more significant since it came, not from preachers, not from those who are looking at it from the religious point of view, but from those who are looking at it on the one hand upon the purely professional and on the other hand from the scientific view. Here is an interesting and important point: that they all agree that society is itself a unit, differing from the individuals of which it is composed.

Let us go further. We have in the first place to differentiate this unity which society thus formed constitutes from the average mind. The aggregate mind does not mean then the average mind, as if, so to speak, we should pool our intellectual resources and then communistically divide up. The average mind exists only on paper, the aggregate mind exists in reality. "Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name,"—one of the profoundest utterances, I believe, that the Master ever made,—"where two or three are gathered together (for high purposes) in my name, there I am in their midst."

The aggregate mind again is to be distinguished from the hypothetical "subjective" mind, which, as a matter of fact, is nothing more nor less than the vermiform appendix of the brain. The moment five hundred people come into a hall the physical temperature is raised. Every janitor *ought* to know that, if he does not; and he will allow for it. But there is another change going on simultaneously with that. There is not only a rise of temperature, there is also an elevation of temperament. The five hundred people are living in a higher realm than they were before.

They are more sensitive, more idealistic, more easily appealed to. Their souls are more ready to respond to the true, the good and the beautiful than any one of these same men would be taken on the street by himself.

Further than that, the aggregate mind represents human nature at its normal, not its abnormal, nor its supernormal. Men are at their best when they are sitting elbow to elbow, thinking about high things.

So far about the preliminaries as to this report of the census-maker.

There are four counts in the report of the census-taker, —four characteristics that the aggregate mind, this society, this church, is trying to deal with; and those characteristics must, in some fashion, indicate for us how our work is to be done. Note these four simple characteristics, as indicated by Le Bon in his study of the "Crowd," as suggested by Mr. Booth, the actor, as discovered by Mr. Gladstone.

The first characteristic that differentiates the aggregate mind from the individual mind is this: every aggregate mind, every large body of people, is in its very nature in the attitude of belief never sceptical, always ready to believe a thing that is put forth to them in fair fashion,— not only that, but the aggregate mind is in an attitude of belief which at a moment's notice can be dissipated and disintegrated by criticism. So sensitive is it. One needs simply to read history to find not only the confirmation of this, but the illustration of this. Here is Paul before the high priest, threatened with his life. He understands, unconsciously it would seem, the working of this aggregate mind. When he sees that it is simply a question of a few moments before he will be hurried out, he at once makes a criticism that disintegrates this aggregate mind, decomposes it into its individual elements; and he simply does it by making one criticism, just one word. They were all there in the attitude of belief; but simply one word disintegrates them, and makes them all doubt. He says, "I am a Pharisee." Forthwith each man begins to say to himself, "I am not a Pharisee: I am a Sadducee." Immediately the whole aggregate mind is broken up as in a sea of glass, and there is no more aggregate mind: it is a mob. Pilate understood it. People had come before him asking that Jesus should be released. Weak morally, too weak even to do a mean thing alone, Pilate understands almost unconsciously that he can work his will best simply by disintegrating this aggregate mind. So he be-

gins by putting doubts in their minds, and says: "It is customary for us to release somebody on this occasion. Doubts there are in my mind who it shall be. There is a man here named Jesus in whom I have found no ill, but that does not follow that there is none there." Instantaneously the whole mind is decomposed. This crowd says, "Give us Barabbas," and you have a mob. That principle is illustrated everywhere. In the finest play, let one shout, "Fire!" and you have no aggregate mind, but an aggregation of insane minds. Criticism, fear, anything which disturbs the attitude of belief, throws each one back into his separate individual life.

The second characteristic of the aggregate mind is that you can move it in any direction, provided you begin where it is and move in a straight line. The aggregate mind will move in any direction that you please if you will allow it to start from where it is and allow it to go in a straight course. So every theatrical manager knows that, whatever diversity there is in his play, there must be running through it all one straight line of purpose or plot of humor or tragedy. It may be, so that this mind may travel upon it. It is the principle of human nature everywhere. Every one in the aggregate will go where you want him to go, provided you will start him where he is and take him there directly.

The third characteristic of the aggregate mind is that it abhors all abstractions and craves the concrete. We do not listen to abstractions that are up in the air and unintelligible, but ask forthwith: "What is it? Give us illustrations of it. How does it look in the realm of matter?"

So in the old country you will find the longest and most tedious journeys broken up by little shrines on this side of the road and on the other. The man who invented that custom, understood the aggregate mind, understood that any man will go on a pilgrimage of thought, if you will only let him start from his own hearthstone and let him travel straight and let him feel that other souls have travelled the same way.

The fourth characteristic of the aggregate mind is that it loves the heroic and the ideal, but only the heroic and ideal as seen and believed to be in personalities. Consequently the world will foget the "Faerie Queen," but it never forgets the "Idyls of the King." It may forget Adam Smith and his "Wealth of Nations," but it will not forget Johnson's "Rasselas." The world may forget Augustine's "City of God," but we all remember "Utopia."

The aggregate mind seizes at once upon the ideal and the heroic in the artistic and the dramatic, if only it can incarnate this in some manner, so that the aggregate mind can feel that "such as these have lived and died."

Now it may be asked, Where is the straight line? There ought to be two, and they ought to be parallel; and I ask you to look for a moment and see how these four principles of the aggregate mind must direct our religious work, if our work with society at large is to have anything more than the semblance of success.

1. First, in dealing with a congregation on Sunday, we are not dealing with individual units. The Mr. A. that we saw in the home is not the Mr. A. sitting in the pew: he is a different man. His temperament has been transfigured. You can say things to him now, and he will take it kindly. He may make resolutions now that would simply have staggered him at home. He is in an attitude of belief. He resents criticism now. He craves positiveness. So the first characteristic, it would seem from this new point of view, must be that whatever we do in the Sunday-school or church must be characterized by absolute positiveness. He who hesitates is lost. One-half of the strength of the older churches lies in the fact that they think sincerely that they have an absolutely sure thing. There is no doubt about it in their minds; and the aggregate mind never disintegrates by criticism, is never thrown back into its individual life, never decomposed by a doubt, because they are morally certain of it.

Now that is not so easy for us; and yet, friends, I venture to suggest that we ignore that at our own peril. It is only in proportion as we are positive, not necessarily that our belief is the only belief,—no one but a fool cherishes that idea,—but positive that we have something that is worth listening to; that it is only as we are moved by a spirit like that that we can hope to accomplish anything.

The author of the "African Farm" has a saying that, when a man tears away from the superstitions of life some of the claws still hang to him. Doctors tell us that, after a man has had his arm amputated, his fingers still itch. An hallucination it may be, but to him it is very real. One of the claws, one of the itchings, with many so-called liberal people, is the desire to get even with the other man. They have been victims of a superstition, as they think; and, now that they are emancipated, they "rattle their chains to show that they are free." There is danger that with certain temperaments our preachers shall be more of

a danger-sign than a guide-post. The moment that attitude is taken toward the aggregate mind, the very moment that position is assumed before a large congregation, each element is decomposed into its own separate will again. He becomes a Presbyterian, a Methodist, a conservative Unitarian, a radical Unitarian, or what not, as he was when he came in. And necessarily so. This principle of the necessity for absolute positiveness in whatever we undertake with the aggregate mind is often violated by our love of fair play. It has been said that we would find some good to say about the devil; and, as the old lady said, "he certainly is very industrious." More than once you and I have listened to Unitarian sermons, or rather to sermons by Unitarians—for they are two different things,—in which the ground has been amply covered in which the point has been pressed home and it seemed as if the great congregation would rise, and say, "Speak thou unto us, and we will do it." And then the minister has said, "This is largely a matter of temperament." Or he has stated his brief: he has outlined his presentation of some higher duty for a man; and when the aggregate mind is all ready to close upon the proposition, and accept it as an auto-suggestion for the coming days, the preacher says, "I doubt not, friend, and there is something to be said on the other side. Let us pray." [Laughter.]

What is the result of that? Only one thing: the aggregate mind is at once promptly and peremptorily disintegrated. That congregation has not been helped: it has been lowered, because they were ready for the revelation, and no revelation came; and it is hard to get them back to the same altitude again.

We are tempted to violate this principle in our zeal for church extension. Where the zealous man goes into a new section of the country and says, almost in hyper-consciousness, "I don't want to pass for what I am not: I want to make it distinctly understood in this community that I am a Unitarian, and that I do not believe certain things." So he says to himself: "The first thing I must do is to define my position. I must differentiate this church, which is about to be, from the other churches that are; and I must convince the people that this church is needed." Let us go back to our principle that the aggregate mind *already* believes. The fact that you are here to establish a church already convinces the aggregate mind that that church is needed. The moment the process of differentiation begins, the moment the mind begins

to doubt, it disintegrates; and next Sunday you announce that the service is postponed indefinitely. So it would seem that the first want for our work is one which we might take to heart. Emerson, who seems to have understood the laws of the mind without being a psychologist, said: "Omit the negative propositions. Arm us with incessant affirmatives."

We have a gospel to preach: then let us preach it. Let us not admit that it is a matter of temperament whether the world is to believe it or that it depends upon a phrenological examination of a man's head whether he is to believe it or not. The moment we hesitate we are lost.

2. The second article in the report of the census collector is that the aggregate mind can be induced to move in any direction from where it stands if you will only ask it to move in a straight line, which, being interpreted, means that the aggregate mind craves simplicity. As the straight line is the shortest distance between two points, so the aggregate mind says, "If you wish to accomplish your purpose, takes us on the shortest way." Now simplicity is not one of the virtues that is born with Unitarians. It is one of the things we have to cultivate. A Unitarian sermon in monosyllables would be a curiosity. Only a little while ago I asked a friend what he was going to preach on Sunday, and he said, "The Empirical Value of Unitarianism." I said, "May God help you!" [Laughter.] What did he mean? Why, he meant that Unitarianism was a good thing to live by. Why in the name of common sense did he not say so? Why ask the aggregate mind to go around Robin Hood's barn, when the doors are open on both sides and we can go through it? Many of us think that we are profound when we are only muddy, and some people think that the stream is very shallow because it is clear. Both are mistakes. But it is hard for us to cultivate simplicity, because we have come from the giants of the world,—Dr. Holmes, Lowell, Emerson, those great souls who wrote their sermons as essays, whose sermons were read in the cultivated homes of Boston, read at a time when there were not the distractions and diversions that there are today. Now another generation has come on the floor, and have studied our great models, and said, "We can quote if we cannot understand the essays of Emerson;" and we think we must imitate his style. There are many who had rather make an epigram than save a soul. There is some truth, quite too much truth for a smile, in the story where one man said to a Unitarian, "Will you tell me the differ-

ence between a sin and an impropriety?" "Well," said he, "a sin can be forgiven, but an impropriety cannot." [Laughter.] There is just enough of truth in that. But men are not waiting to hear somebody who would rather enunciate a balanced sentence, a finished period, than send the gospel of God right home in Anglo-Saxon phrase, so that it should haunt men. The aggregate mind resents sesquipedalian words, and will not travel by curves, but wants to go straight on. I said this was a virtue which had to be cultivated. One of our New England poets virtually admits that. Emerson, you remember, said that he would pray for the gift of continuity. The prayer was not answered. [Laughter.] Lowell prayed for the same gift of simplicity, and the prayer was partly answered. It was the Scotchman who woke him up. When he was travelling abroad and saw the rude-handed Scots reading Burns's poems, then and there Lowell was converted to simplicity, and he wrote:—

> It may be glorious to write
> Thoughts that shall glad the two or three
> High souls, like those far stars that come in sight
> Once in a century;
>
> But better far it is to speak
> One simple word, which now and then
> Shall waken their free nature in the weak
> And friendless sons of men,
>
> To write some earnest verse or line,
> Which, seeking not the praise of art,
> Shall make a clearer faith and manhood shine
> In the untutored heart.

Not until the demon of literary vanity is entirely cast out of us will the spirit of the Holy Ghost possess us. Not until we leave, once for all, the pedantry of the schools and come into the chamber of devotion, will the tongues of fire touch us, so that every man shall hear us speaking in his own tongue.

3. The third principle of our census-taker is that the aggregate mind loves the heroic and the concrete, must have it. Here is the principal question applied to every phase of our religious work. We are tempted to forget that the men who are now living want to have their experience interpreted, not by the book of Revelation or by the book of Daniel, but by a gospel, which throbs with life. They crave the concrete. Our very first virtue is in danger of

becoming our most deadly sin,—namely, the open-mindedness of our faith,—which makes us the champion of almost every new thought. The danger is that we shall put our lumber into our house before it is well seasoned, and we shall talk about things with great enthusiasm and use mystical words with a high meaning, when the simple fact of the case is, we have not yet grasped it. It is very well to "hitch your wagon to a star;" but too many of us are trying to make connection with some nebula or some comet, and the thing does not go. The feeling is abroad that people, for instance, are not interested in evolution. No, they are. It is the one thing in which the aggregate mind is interested. Where, then, is the fault? It was said, you know, that, if Shakespeare's works were all destroyed, there were a score of Englishmen who could reproduce or transcribe them. It is true that, if Hegel's works were lost, if Herbert Spencer's works were destroyed, there are a score of Unitarian ministers who could transcribe them all from memory. One does not see why they should not; they have been doing it for the last twenty years. [Laughter.] But the trouble is here: the aggregate mind does not want evolution preached, it wants evolution practised. Now the very first law of evolution is not an abstraction: it is concrete; namely, the law of adaptation to our environment. So it comes about that many a man who is preaching the abstract theme of evolution is violating the very first principle of his thesis by failing to adapt himself to his environment. He forgets that the aggregate mind craves not the abstract, but the concrete; that it cares nothing for the book of Revelation, but everything for Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; that it cares for the ideals of the men in them; that nothing that is human is without interest to it. It must be made to see human life evolving.

4. Lastly, the fourth characteristic of the aggregate mind is that it loves the heroic and the ideal, but only as they are incorporated in personality, not for themselves. No placarding virtues, no automatic virtues, such as we have in the "Faerie Queen," for instance, where you can see the poet back there pulling the wires: that does not appeal to them. They want to feel that they are flesh and blood. Here, I believe, is our strongest and our weakest point. The aggregate mind, society, is hungering for the very gospel we have to give them; but it will not accept the gospel save as that gospel can be attached to some living personality. The experience of every one of us

proves that. The church that denies *in toto* the deity of Jesus Christ will turn right around and worship its minister. [Laughter.] The minister will deny *in toto* the deity of Jesus Christ and the infallibility of the Scriptures, and then he will quote Huxley and Emerson as if they were the ultimate authority in their different realms. It simply illustrates this principle: that the tree of life, in its early stages at least, must have something to climb on. I think there is a hint here for our work. The world will love to see simple principles of human nature interpreted and illustrated by the life of Jesus Christ. When there is no criticism offered, the aggregate mind will accept this; but a single word can spoil it all. Take an illustration. A large audience is like a full charged organ, so sensitive that, if you but touch it, a note comes forth. Suppose you say to a large congregation, "Jesus Christ was a man just like you" Instantly the aggregate mind is disintegrated beyond repair at that service. Suppose, however, you say exactly the same thing in another way: "Jesus Christ was just exactly such a man as you may become." What is the difference? The difference is that in this latter statement you have obeyed those four laws of the aggregate mind; you have made positive assertion, you have made it in a straight line; you have made it so that it seems heroic, and you have endowed it with throbbing vitality, because you have linked it to his nature. So with all the great principles; they can be illustrated in the simplest terms; and, when we Unitarians learn how to do it, the church at work will be at work successfully.

THE CHURCH AT WORSHIP.

BY REV. WILLIAM MILTON BRUNDAGE, PH. D.

In a sense profoundly true the church at work is the church at worship. To labor is to pray. He who does not work does not worship. The primary meaning of worship is to attribute worth; worth-ship becomes softened to worship. But it means more than this. To recognize that which is worthy, to love and revere it, to devote one's self to its service,—all this is implied in the word. Belief, love, reverence, and devoted service are therefore essential elements in true worship. Supreme worship can be given only to that which is of supreme worth measured by the moral ideals of life.

He who possesses no high moral ideal cannot worship. To him there is no such reality as truth, beauty, justice, goodness, love. He measures everything by the mere pleasure it affords him or by the pain it helps him to avoid, not know what genuine worship means.

One may believe theoretically in the reality of truth, beauty, justice, goodness, love; but, so long as he fails to love and reverence them, he is no worshipper. He may even love and revere them in a superficial, sentimental fashion; but so long as he does not devote himself to these realities, does not seek to realize them in his life, he does not know what genuine worship means.

Worship in any true sense is possible only to man, and only to that man who has attained to the ideal of supreme moral worth. In the long process of evolution a critical moment was at last reached when this ideal of moral worth first dawned upon the human mind. Up to that time worship had been impossible: thereafter to refuse to worship became almost impossible. The normal man perceived in his own mind a scale of values, as J. B. Crozier describes it, by which he measured worth. According to this scale, truth is better, infinitely better, than falsehood, beauty than ugliness, justice than injustice, love and goodwill than hatred and ill-will. At the first these ideals were crude and imperfect, just as in the minds of multitudes of people they are crude and imperfect to this day. But

the scale in the mind was there: the man had begun to perceive the worth of these ideals, to worship them. His God had become a moral Being that deserved his worship.

Long before this time the savage had prostrated himself in terror before the ghost of his dead chieftain, perhaps his earliest god; but this prostration with its sacrifices and incantations did not constitute true worship any more than the prostration of multitudes of men and women throughout Christendom to-day before the God of some ethically discredited theology can be said to constitute true worship. True worship is something very different from this. "To worship rightly" is to recognize the moral worth of the infinite God, to love and revere him, and to dedicate one's self to the realization of God's will in one's own personal life and throughout human society. True worship implies moral aspiration, devotion, service, the absolute commitment of one's life to his ideals, to his God whose will represents the worshipper's highest and holiest and best. There is no other worship worthy of the name.

According to this definition, therefore, the church at work is manifestly the church at worship; for, unless the church is persistently and zealously working toward the realization of the highest and holiest and best, it has not begun to worship at all. What is called distinctively a service of worship is worse than useless, worse than a mere waste of time and effort, unless it ministers to the church at work. Long prayers, rapturous, ecstatic communion with the Infinite, mystic contemplation and adoration which exhaust the vital energies of the devotee and make the common every-day service of truth, justice, and goodwill distasteful and irksome, do not constitute true worship; they are a positive hindrance to it. To complete the act of worship, we must work. The practical activities of a church, therefore, are vitally related to its devotional activities; are but two stages of the one complete act: to worship and to work cannot be separated even in thought.

What was probably in the mind of the author of the programme of this Conference was the consideration at this time of that which is distinctively known as the public religious service, the service of public worship. We all know that there is a growing number of liberal people who minimize the importance of this service. Church attendance does not begin to be as common as it used to be. It is a rare thing to find a church thronged as it was in the past. Not only is it certainly true that a much smaller

per cent. of the entire population attend church to-day than did attend twenty-five years ago, but also a smaller per cent. of the church members attend than did at that time. What is the reason of this decrease of attendance upon the public worship?

Radically different and even contradictory reasons are advanced to explain it. On the one hand, you hear it positively affirmed that there is a serious decline in the hold religion has upon the people. There is not as much religion as there used to be. As our civilization daily grows more sordid and commercial, practical materialism is becoming more and more common. A tide of unbelief is sweeping over the world and submerging our religious institutions. In this critical scientific age the old altars are being forsaken, the holy sacraments ignored, the great historic creeds despised. Surely, religion is perishing from the earth.

On the other hand, you hear it affirmed just as positively that the churches are neglected because they have not kept abreast of the religious progress of our time. The hold of practical religion on the people is stronger than ever before, but the churches will not discard their obsolete methods and adapt themselves to modern conditions. Men pray less in the old manner, but they love and serve more. They can worship more satisfactorily in their homes or out under the open sky in the forests, in the fields among the birds and the flowers, or beside the sea, than they can in the conventional church. The priests and the church altars are being forsaken because the priests and the churches have forsaken the living God.

In all probability in both of these assigned reasons for decreased attendance upon church services there is some measure of truth. Certainly there is a vast deal of indifference to religion on the part of multitudes of our people. The glittering material prizes of life made possible by amazing inventions and discoveries of the last century seem to be too attractive for them to resist. Many become so absorbed in business, or in their search after positive knowledge of the physical universe, or in their pursuit of pleasure, that they lose their interest in spiritual things. There is a great deal of genuine unbelief in the God of truth, justice, and good-will, and of genuine belief in the god of money and of large battalions.

No evolutionist, however, who perceives the goal toward which the universe is progressing, no theistic evolutionist who believes in the everlasting reality of religion,

can affirm that pure and undefiled religion is perishing from the earth. No serious thoughtful student of the past as well as of his own time can fail to be persuaded that never before were there so many men and women enamoured of the good life as there are to-day, that never before in human history did so many appreciate the supreme importance of truth, justice, and human brotherhood as they do to-day, that never before was there so much disinterested devotion to the noblest ends of life, never before was there so much ethical enthusiasm, so much genuine religion.

Much of this truly religious devotion is found outside of organized religion, outside of all churches; but it is religious all the same. We rightly claim as religious men those in every community who are religious without being conscious of it, those who according to conventional ideas possess no religion, who themselves lay claim to none, who are nevertheless more keenly sensitive, more promptly responsive to every word of truth, to every manifestation of beauty, to every act of justice and good-will, than many of us who make the loudest profession. These men see more in the universe than any of us see. They feel more keenly any lack of harmony between their actual lives and their ideals. They are more uncompromising in their obedience to conscience. They labor more resolutely to win the approval of the God within their own breast. They are readier than most of us to make heroic sacrifices for noble spiritual ends. They live lives of greater value to human society. Certainly, if religion possesses any meaning worth contending for, these men outside of all churches who urge no claim whatsoever must be considered among the most religious of us all.

While, therefore, we confidently believe that there is more religion in the world than ever before, we must frankly recognize the fact that it is not all found within the organized church; and we must further admit what seems to be a fact equally well established,—that in many of our churches there is less vital religion than there used to be. These churches continue to maintain themselves largely because of the momentum of the past not yet exhausted, but without fresh supplies of energy they cannot long persist.

It is justly complained that in these churches the old ritual of worship, hallowed though it be by the associations of the past, is not adapted to the needs of to-day. Once it corresponded with reality, and voiced the deepest long-

ings and aspirations of the human heart. Its creeds, hymns, and prayers rang out to the thought of the time; they do not, however, ring true to the thought of the twentieth century. In the minds of thoughtful men they are discredited, outgrown, interesting only as memorials of the past. They no longer correspond to man's real ideals, no longer express his profoundest convictions of truth.

Again, it is complained that in these churches the ritual of worship is narrow and more or less sectarian. It is not broad enough, sympathetic enough, all-inclusive enough to satisfy the spirit of our time.

In our worship we have been accustomed to sing:—

"Like a mighty army
Moves the church of God;
Brothers, we are treading
Where the saints have trod;
We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and *doctrine*,
One in charity."

What has been too often understood and is plainly implied by the words is something like this: We, the members of our sect, our denomination, or the group of denominations which agree most nearly in doctrine with us,—we are like "a mighty army," we constitute "the church of God," as undivided in doctrine as in hope and charity.

To become adapted to the ritual of worship demanded by the more catholic spirit of our time, this hymn (I use the hymn simply as a type of its class) must be changed in some such way as this:—

Not

"All one body we,
One in hope and *doctrine*,
One in charity,"

but rather

"One in hope and *purpose*,
One in charity."

One, because all of us, religious men and women of every name, of every creed, are working in the same spirit toward the same noble ends; one in the same attitude toward our highest and holiest ideals, our God; one in our devotion to our fellow-men; one in the all-compelling motive to help the world upward and onward. Samuel Longfellow has given us a church hymn which admirably expresses the new spirit:—

"One holy church of God appears
Through every age and race."

The prayers of the modern ritual, like the hymns, must express the outpouring of the universal human heart, without a discordant note, without the suspicion of a sectarian bias. The Lord's Prayer is of this character; but how few of the other prayers of various rituals are! Many of them presuppose a narrow and sectarian view of man and of God and of the aims of life, which it is impossible that liberal and conservative, kneeling side by side, can use together.

What is true of the hymns and the prayers is true of the Scripture readings of the ritual. If they are to minister effectively to the spiritual needs of the men of to-day, they must be wisely selected,—not exclusively from one source, but from what Thomas De Quincey calls "the literature of power" of all nations and of all times, always with the frank recognition that the literature of the Old and New Testaments occupy the first place in value and importance.

I for one do not believe that we can easily overestimate the importance of social worship in our churches that shall be broad and sympathetic in spirit and true to the thought of our time. We may be perfectly ready to admit that no priest or minister is necessary to constitute true worship; that no church is necessary; that one may worship God under the open sky, in the fields, or in the forest or beside the sea, just as truly as in the customary house of prayer. We may frankly admit that wherever there are found men and women who are serving a noble unpopular cause with disinterested devotion, wherever men and women in true self-forgetfulness are seeking to uplift the fallen, to comfort the broken-hearted, and encourage the weak and hopeless, there is found genuine worship that cannot be misunderstood.

The practical question is not whether the rare and gifted individual can get along without the social worship of the church, but whether the average man can get along without it, whether he will be as apt to "do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with his God" without its uplift and inspiration as with it, and whether even the rare and gifted will not be the better with it than without it. Because we are social beings, we need the help that comes from genuine social worship to fit us for the noblest activities of life. I do not believe that there is anything that can take its place, any substitute for it that can pro-

duce just the same results. For those who, while they differ from one another in belief, share a common spirit and are working toward a common end, to come together and together commune with their God means infinitely more in the re-enforcement of the individual's flagging courage, in the quickening of his faith, in the deepening of his devotion, in the comforting of his sorrow, in the enrichment of his spiritual life, than solitary worship amid the most beautiful and sublime scenery the world affords.

The great Companion is never far from any one of us, but we are not always and everywhere equally conscious of his presence.

> "The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers;
> Little we see in nature that is ours;
> We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon."

The church at worship ought to (and does, at its best) help men to get back their "hearts," help them to catch the vision, hear the voice. It lifts them to a higher plane of thought and feeling, into a purer, diviner atmosphere, in which they can see more clearly and truly, in which their material interests lose their exaggerated importance and sink into insignificance in comparison with the great spiritual interests of life. In the conscious presence of their God they pledge themselves anew to the unfinished tasks awaiting them. Their ideals become distinctly defined, and regain the reality which they had lost. They once more perceive that only in the service of those ideals can they be at one with their God.

Unassisted by their fellows, only those rare and gifted spirits among us are able to catch the vision and hear the voice. The ordinary man finds the stern struggle for bread too absorbing; he lives at too high a pressure, is distracted by too many cares. His eyes are glued upon the ground. Left to himself, he finds it almost impossible to lift them up to the mountains, whence alone cometh his help. Certainly, the church at worship has a divine mission to him.

If there are any among us who feel that they do not need the inspiration of social worship, the consciousness that others need them ought to be a sufficiently powerful motive to induce them to unite with their fellows. After all, it is what we can give, more than what we can get, that ought to constrain us. Thus, coming together in the

spirit of a true worshipper, in the spirit of a sympathetic brother man, forgetting for the moment all that divides, ignoring all merely individual idiosyncrasies, we can best help one another to the possession of "that quenchless faith" without which life would not be worth the living.

"I believe in the communion of saints." Surely, there is no nobler article than this in the Apostle's Creed. When men once come to believe in it, they will be irresistibly drawn to the public service of worship and will help to lift it to its best.

We know that Emerson after many years of absence from the village church at Concord, went back to it again because of what he found it meant to his spiritual life. Gifted prophet though he was, he needed the help that came to him in the social worship as much as his fellow-worshippers needed him.

Only recently a layman of our fellowship, one of the most devout and thoughtful of our writers, confessed to me that, after a long absence, he, too, had gone back to take his place in the church because he had missed its services. He had thought that he could get along better without the church than with it, but he had discovered his mistake. He had determined hereafter to exert all his personal influence to help to make the church at worship more efficient.

One word more in conclusion. To produce the best spiritual results, I do not believe that we need an elaborate ritual of worship. To many of us, the simpler the service, the better. We prefer that more be left to our imagination. We worship best when we are free from the distractions of conventional forms.

I for one dislike to hear those of our own fellowship criticise "our bare, uninteresting congregational service." It is bare and uninteresting only when the singing is merely perfunctory, when the Scripture readings are carelessly selected and slovenly interpreted, when the prayers are labored and artificial. It is bare and uninteresting only when a warm human sympathy and a devotional spirit are wanting. And who but ourselves are to blame for this spiritual barrenness?

Certainly there can be no objection to the introduction of an elaborate musical and responsive service for those who like it, provided the spirit of true social worship be not sacrificed. But to many of us the only enrichment of the service of worship that really counts is the introduction into our simple congregational forms of a more

profoundly devout spirit, of a more intelligent and adequate appreciation of the presence of our God, and of an enlargement of our social sympathies. We cannot be persuaded that any merely æsthetic elaboration of the service is calculated to help us to feel more deeply the ties that bind us to one another and to the great family of God or to help us to realize more thoroughly the supreme worth of our ideals and the demands they make upon us.

After all, the final test of the value of our worship will be the fidelity of our service.

"Oh, he whom Jesus loved hath truly spoken!
The holier worship which he deigns to bless
Restores the lost, and binds the spirit broken,
And feeds the widow and the fatherless.

"Then, brother man, fold to thy heart thy brother.
Where pity dwells, the peace of God is there.
To worship rightly is to love each other,
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer."

THE CHURCH AT WORSHIP.

BY REV. LEWIS G. WILSON.

A small child of my acquaintance was not long since examining closely a silver half-dollar. With that fresh and unaffected curiosity peculiar to childhood, he studied the features of the goddess of Liberty, counted the leaves in the laurel wreath, the stars and the arrows, and then began slowly to decipher the legend at the top. After several vain attempts to sound the various words, at last he exclaimed triumphantly, "In Gold we trust."

I had for some time been trying to find a simple and concise statement of the spiritual attitude of this generation. The oft-repeated and rarely challenged commonplace remark that ours is *not* an age of faith I had always felt was grievously at fault,—as if to increase our knowledge, our opportunities and our wants was to decrease in like ratio, our faith in the possibliity of having those wants satisfied. But just how to characterize in good form the faith that I knew existed everywhere among competent men and women did not occur to me until I received it from the lips of the little child. In substituting the word "Gold" for "God," it does not follow that there is any less faith in the world than there was in the time of Abraham, or of Cotton Mather, when men said "thee" and "thou" and filled their conversation with quotations from the Old Testament. It simply means that our first conscious recognition and homage turns to a secondary instead of a primary cause. And it is likewise true, especially among those who have formed orderly habits of thought, that the sense of an irresistible primary cause is ever present as a subconscious reality. Our knowledge concerning the law of gravitation rises, perhaps, above the realm of faith. But it is in a most perfect faith that we yield ourselves to it, believe in it when to all appearance it fails to operate, and build our theories and make our inventions in the absolute trust that it will respond instantly from the uttermost regions of the universe to the lightest footfall of the smallest child. Such faith neither Elijah nor the priests

of Baal possessed. In the instant and inevitable chemical affinity between oxygen and hydrogen,—seeking each other and uniting with mathematical precision,—our faith is as perfect as was that of Moses when he struck the rock of Horeb with his prophet's staff to quench the thirst of the children of Israel. In the law of ethereal rhythm, our faith is equivalent to knowledge, although probably not one person in ten thousand could furnish the reasons upon which our belief is founded. Two vessels at sea, separated by many miles and far beyond sight and hearing of each other, are sending and receiving messages when there is absolutely nothing between them which can be apprehended by any one of our five senses, and scarcely by the average human mind. A more practical faith the centurion of the New Testament, who said to Jesus, "Speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed," could not have possessed.

In all the so-called ages of faith it has been exceedingly difficult to tell where faith began and superstition and credulity left off. It is equally difficult to-day to determine where knowledge leaves off and faith begins; but, if there ever was an age where the faith of reason controlled in human affairs, and an absolute confidence in the mechanical, social, and moral integrity of the universe was supreme, when men have felt a perfect conviction of things not seen, and find themselves involved in a cosmic order which rules as well in the microscopic nettle-hair and among the awful spaces of Orion and Pleiades, that is this present age.

Without a simple, childlike, and inviolable faith, worship is an affectation and a sham, and the higher *type* of worship is impossible. And it is because this faith of ours is so common, so childlike, and so simple to-day that nothing but the higher type of worship can satisfy the rational nature of modern humanity.

In what I have to say now, let it be understood at once that I have no time to speak of worship in general nor of Christian churches as a whole. The need is so great that we as Unitarians should understand what worship means for us and what it may do for us that I shall confine myself wholly to Unitarian worship; for if I mistake not, it is in our own church that we shall find an abundance of this faith to which I have referred. We believe in universal harmony and order, and our faith is absolute that the kingdom of God belongs to that man whose free will conforms to the divine will. As Unitarians, we have inherited

a certain spiritual attitude. It is this spiritual attitude more than anything else—more than opinion, more than theological conception, and more than intellectual ability —which differentiates us from the other sects or denominations of the Christian world. In all our public or private worship we cannot feel sincere if we abandon our inherited spiritual attitude and attempt by the introduction of other forms and methods to assume a spiritual attitude not familiar to us. It has become a spiritual necessity with us that we remain loyal to our own specific genius; and, should the time ever come that we are carried away by the spectacular fascinations of ceremonialism or the emotional rhapsodies of evangelical sensationalism, it will be difficult to find a name to describe us, for we shall have lost our spiritual poise and become neither consistent Unitarians nor graceful and natural imitators of others.

What is that attitude? What is this genius that has come down through the ages, selecting its own always, and always shaping the character of its disciples and forming the nature of their worship? Better than in any other place it is indicated by certain gospel utterances.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and, having shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret. . . . And in praying use not vain repetitions."

The young prophet, John the Baptist, had been beheaded. The disciples had buried his body. "Now, when Jesus heard it, he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart."

"When the chief priests and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children that were crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the son of David! they were moved with indignation" (it was the spontaneous praise of childhood, it was not good form), "and said unto him, Hearest thou what these are saying? And Jesus said unto them, Yea: did ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?"

Throughout the Gospels, passages of this nature are numerous, showing that the one greatest obstacle which the young prophet encountered to the promotion of his doctrine of spiritual worship was the sacerdotal attitude of the Jewish Church. The mediatorial function of the priest, with all the mechanism and all the ecclesiastical display which it involved, was repugnant to his sense of personal nearness and oneness with God; and it is, therefore, not surprising that, if we search the Gospels from

end to end, we shall scarcely find a single utterance of his complimentary to the priestly idea, while, on the other hand, his constant and terrible denunciations of the priesthood throw into dazzling relief his culminating definition of true worship,—"God is Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." That is, we are units of life, and we are each separately related to the Infinite Unit of Life; and through him—and only through him, and not through any priest—we are related to each other.

The genius of our worship is individual and spiritual,—a perpetual attempt to keep before the world and to realize in our own experience, despite all temptations to accept what is merely formal and impressive in outward expression, what Renan called "the foundation of all pure worship, of all ages, of all lands—that which all elevated souls will practise to the end of time."

Our inherited spiritual attitude does not compromise or violate the rational sense. Beyond Jesus our spiritual ancestry are found, not among the priests, but among the prophets. Not in Leviticus where the burnt-offering and the meat-offering and the oblations and the guilt-offering and the peace-offering are set forth in minute detail, but in Isaiah, where it says: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams and fat of fed beasts. . . . When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample my courts. . . . And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear." Our lineal spiritual descent is not from Moses when he took the blood of the offering, "and put it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand and upon the great toe of his right foot," but from Moses when some of his officials complained because there were two men in the camp who undertook to speak the truth in a spirit of personal independence, not being among the chosen seventy. And he cried, "Would God all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them!"

Since the time of Jesus our spiritual genealogy contains many great names of men who, independently of established authorities, have set forth the terms in which God has revealed himself to them as individuals. It was the controlling spirit of the English Reformation. When Cromwell's house at Huntingdon became a resort of so-

called "godly men," it simply meant that a spiritual centre was formed there which was to gather power sufficient to overthrow a corrupt sacerdotalism and to liberate men and women into the freedom of spiritual responsibility. And it afterward became apparent that the man who, in a spirit of righteous indignation, should lay the most beautiful abbey in ruins, was to become as truly a saint as the patron through whose munificent piety it was builded.

In the old cathedral of St. Giles in Edinburgh is this inscription on a brass tablet not far from the present pulpit:—

TO JAMES HANNAY, D.D., DEAN OF THIS CATHEDRAL, 1634-1639.

HE WAS THE FIRST AND THE LAST WHO READ THE SERVICE BOOK IN THIS CHURCH. THIS MEMORIAL IS ERECTED IN HAPPIER TIMES BY HIS DESCENDANT.

The reason why Dean Hannay read the service book for the first and the last time is found upon another tablet not far away, which reads as follows:—

CONSTANT ORAL TRADITION AFFIRMS THAT NEAR THIS SPOT A BRAVE SCOTCH WOMAN, JANET GEDDES, ON THE 23d OF JULY, 1637, STRUCK THE FIRST BLOW IN THE GREAT STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE WHICH, AFTER A CONFLICT OF HALF A CENTURY, ENDED IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

Now the way that Janet Geddes struck this blow was by throwing a footstool at the head of Dean Hannay when he attempted to meet the royal wish by giving out the collect to be read from the English Prayer Book. It was not merely the prejudice of an infuriated woman that committed that act of violence upon the dean. It was the spiritual power of the people finding expression at last, and, when once liberated, taking possession of their spiritual inheritance. Only a few years before this the Pilgrims had settled at Plymouth, in the same spirit; and the Puritans were rapidly arriving in New England. Their theology was severe, their intellectual conception of human and divine relations were Hebraic to the last degree; but the transcendent idea for which they stood and for which they had suffered was the doctrine of individual spiritual responsibility, and that is our supreme denominational life-thought, preserved, be it said in all reverence, against all dogmas, institutions, and creeds from Abraham to Edward Everett Hale.

Now I have purposely attempted to state the nature of our spiritual attitude because when we, as a church, are at our devotions, we are sometimes tempted to think that we are a little company of heretics, contemporaneous and coextensive with a certain organization called the American Unitarian Association, having a great many rather undignified "orders of service," somewhat afraid to repeat responses from the Psalms, fearing lest we shall not keep time with the other members of the congregation, and not at all given to crying Hallelujah, and not so familiar as we sometimes wish we were with the proper places in the Prayer Book when by any chance we wander into an Episcopal church.

Our moods are controlled by trivial conditions; and we cannot always see wherein we are standing loyally for the noblest, blessedest, and mightiest principle of worship, especially when we come together in our plain congregational meeting-houses and find the singing of hymns not very good, the chanting of Psalms altogether impossible, and the extempore prayers rather dull and more or less incorrect from a Scriptural point of view.

Religion is the upward and onward yearning of the world since time began. It is this at least, whatever else it may be. And genuine Christian worship is that conscious upward look which ever attends the upward yearning. It is religion articulated. This upward yearning which we call religion expresses itself in the entire field of human interests,— in affairs, in letters, in poetry, in science, in invention, in progress of every kind where the personal loyalty is inspired and where the good, the true, and the beautiful are sought after. In worship of the true sort, ideals are clearly formulated, the soul is cleansed, resolutions are made, and the low and the obsolete are renounced, and the higher and the holier principles of life are accepted. It is, therefore, worth our while to remember that when we as a church are at our devotions, we are not merely a little company of heretics, contemporaneous and coextensive with a certain organization called the American Unitarian Association, noble and beneficent as that organization is. On the contrary, our church consciousness should inform us that we are there and then holding spiritual relations with every progressive impulse, every sincere prayer, every pure personal desire, and every holy longing that the world has ever known. The Spirit cries, "Behold, I make all things new!" Perpetual renewal is the law of life. Worship fits us to share in this constant

renewal of all things, and to enter heartily and gladly into new conditions of physical and spiritual well-being. Our simple congregational worship may seem cold and even austere to one who judges it from the æsthetic point of view; but such a thing as congregational worship exists at all in the world to-day because certain spiritual realities are accounted of greater value than æsthetic effects or ceremonial proprieties or ecclesiastical formulas. The greatest Christian law of spiritual communion is therein left undisturbed, as it seeks to renew the world by giving the individual soul an unobstructed access to the Father. "Vain repetitions" are avoided, and the prophetic soul is left free from sacerdotal interference.

How many times in all our lives have we desired, with an inexpressible longing, definitions and explanations that should help us to adjust ourselves to the constantly changing conditions of human life! One generation passes away, and another presses on to take its place; and it finds the old world absorbed with its forms, its stereotyped phrases and its words, catchwords, and dogmas. Generations gone and dead reach out their ghostly hands to hold fast those doors that they themselves were never permitted to open. And, in a little while, unless we are left free to reason together, to pray together, to resolve together, to dream dreams of new heavens and new earths together, we find ourselves walking among a host of unrealities, fabulous theories of life, strange and grotesque and lifeless mummies of human thought and labor. It was from such a world of outgrown and outlived authority and speculation that Jesus sought to deliver his generation when he bade them pray to the Father in the secret closet of the soul; and it is from the oppressive influence of a similar antiquity that we are perpetually preserved by the simple privileges of congregational worship.

Some one may ask: Why encourage public worship at all? Why not advocate complete individualism, and leave each person to attend altogether to his own spiritual affairs?

In the first place, the world never has and never will be or can be satisfied with complete individualism. In the second place, so far as external authority or interference is concerned, the individual is left spiritually free by the congregational method. But the most practical reason of all is found in the fact that spiritual power is *consumed* and exhausted by the individual when left to himself, and generated, when he associates himself with others. Some

one has said, "The influences that build up the soul in faith are not arguments, controversies, debates, passion;" and we may add, they are, on the contrary, the great needs, the sympathies, the profound assurances, and the immortal hopes of mankind felt in each other's presence, and expressed as they arise, by those who, at the time, feel them most intensely. Men are quickened, touched, inspired, and comforted, not by isolating themselves and brooding within the limitations of personal experience, but by breaking through those limitations, and sympathetically entering into the lives of others. Truth, for instance, needs no defence; but we are not always polarized for the truth, and are inclined to accept old and easy errors rather than throw aside the spirit of indifference and put on the spirit of truth. Then it is that we need to be touched by a truth-seeker and inspired with his life. We are not always polarized for righteousness. The thought of a good deed or a noble self-sacrifice or a fine self-surrender to some principle or a large, humane, and generous business policy does not leap to our minds and wills as quickly and naturally as an iron filing to a magnet. Then it is that we should find a place where all the ideals of righteousness are presented and prayed for, and urged with all the enthusiasm that a multitude can generate. There are times when life seems insipid, stupid, and worthless,—a dream that never comes true; and, if left to ourselves, we should either relax into a condition of complete *laissez-faire* to all the higher labors and loftier interpretations of life, as so many thousands of intelligent people have needlessly done, or we should become morbidly timid and sensitive, and finally unfitted to meet the ordinary trials and vexations of the common day. How great is our need, at such a time, to enter the atmosphere of aspiration, to feel ourselves nearer to the Source and Preserver of all life, and to be quickened into a wholesome faith in that Power before whose presence a sparrow cannot fall unheeded! It is no chance result that, with the gradual cessation of worship on the part of an increasing population, the number of people committed to insane asylums is correspondingly enlarged. Nor is it the mere caprice of Fate that the character of modern insanity differs from that of the past by being melancholious instead of acutely sensitive and violent. The soul cannot bear isolation. It must be periodically revitalized and refreshed at the Fountain of Life.

But, unless that fountain is a fountain of *living* water,

how can it quench the thirst of living souls? Living souls are not quickened by the dead thoughts of dead men. Where two or three are gathered together in the name of the new life in a new world, there is always present a divine *afflatus* exactly adapted to that particular hour and equal to the personal necessities of those who open the avenues of life for its reception. We sometimes hear it said that we need a denominational prayer book in our church,—a liturgy, if not a complete ritual. There are at least two objections. The first is, it will not be used. The second is, it is not consistent with pure Christianity. In using a liturgy, the inner need of the worshipper does not inspire the thought in the prayer book, but the thought in the prayer book suggests a need which the worshipper may or may not really feel. If we know we are not miserable sinners, to say we are in so many words does not necessarily make us feel so, although, perhaps, it ought to. What we *do* need is a great collection of prayers by many great souls, and it ought to be read in loving sincerity by both clergy and laity in private until by such spiritual association we acquire habits of aspiration. Then, when we come together, the language of natural spontaneous devotion will not be foreign to us. Our meeting-house will be not necessarily a place where one may hear excellent singing, eloquent preaching and beautiful dresses as they rustle up the aisle, but a house of prayer. And that short passage in the book of Acts will be regarded far less in a spirit of critical doubt, and more perfectly in the spirit of experimental knowledge, where it says:—

"And when the day of Pentecost was now come, they were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance."

When I began, I said that this is most certainly an age of faith, current opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. I believe, too, that ours is a church of faith. It is fear that makes men and children spiritually weak. Where shall we find less fear—of living or dying, of the here or the hereafter—than among the old Unitarian families of America, where for generations the spiritual life of such men as Priestley, Parker, Channing, Furness, Clarke, has

moved in love, and with not so much as a suggestion that God ever intended to do by His human children otherwise than the wisest and noblest father would do by his own offspring? A tree is known by its fruits. If fortitude in misfortune, the intelligent acceptance of sickness, pain and sorrow, and the happy anticipation of wonderful things to be revealed at daybreak beyond the sea,—if such characteristics prove the soundness of our faith, where shall you find them more beautifully attained than among those who have never known how to worship God except directly from spirit to spirit, and whose entire religious life finds complete expression in the words, "In him we live and move and have our being"!

There is only one power of gravitation, but the diversity of its operations extend all the way from the bit of thistledown that floats upon the air as if it could never fall to the huge bulk of Halley's comet that goes forging on in reckless way among the stars. For feather or planet the one law of falling bodies is the same.

Religion is one, and it holds alike him who believes in God and him who believes in nothing. The law of rising spirits is the same for all who would rise, whether the Ashantee king bowing before the skeletons of his predecessors or the Christian saint with words of forgiveness upon his dying lips. And that law of rising spirits is very dear to us as a church; for there is nothing higher, and we would put nothing before it. Our church at worship must always fail whenever the people go away less conscious of this highest law of worship: "They that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth." And it always succeeds when, because that law has been respected, the people go away with aspiring souls and full hearts, saying "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; and *so* shall ye be my disciples."

THE GOSPEL FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY REV. M. J. SAVAGE, D. D.

A gospel it must be, nothing other and nothing less. He who presumes to speak to the listening ears, the questioning minds and the burdened hearts of the twentieth century folk, must bring to them good news. If he have no glad tidings to utter, then let him at least keep silence. If there be no outlook for the world, no "far-off, divine event," to justify the age-long groan and travail of the creation, then let each of us find it out as late as possible, when he has to; and then let us bear it with what stoic courage we may; but in the name of humanity and pity, let us keep still about it. Are lips ready to smile? Are eyes bright with their glad outlook over the world? Are hearts lifted up with hope? Why should the flexible mouth be set and hardened, the eyes be tear-blinded, the heart grow heavy before their time? If these things must be, at least they are events one should not be sorry to have postponed. The preacher of pessimism, whether lay or clerical, is not only a calamity, he is an absurdity as well. According to his theory, he predicts an inevitable disaster, and for no purpose except to anticipate the evil and make people miserable before they need to be.

Of course, it is not meant that no hard doctrine should be preached. A difficult and toilsome road that must be trodden with bleeding feet,—this may be the only or the shortest road to some goal of good for the individual or the race. To point this out, even though we shrink from it and take it at last with tears, this is not pessimism; and it may be the best possible of all good news. But to show that all roads lead to a gulf, and after weariness and agony end in nothing at all,—this is a message that can afford to wait. If true, the longer we are ignorant of the truth the better. We do not need to lie. We need not hold out hopes in which we ourselves have no belief. But, if we have no gospel, no good news to utter, at any rate we can keep our mouths shut. There are preachers, lecturers, newspaper and magazine writers, self-imagined philosophers and scientists, on whom I would like to urge this kindly reticence.

A gospel, then! Who is to have the high privilege of proclaiming it? *Those who believe and are free.*

That which has been called "the gospel" in the past most certainly is not good news. Good news for a selected few, if those few be willing to take a partial salvation on such terms,—it has been tidings of disaster and despair to the vast majority of mankind. Agnosticism is cheer and release compared with it. Yea, more. Outright atheism were infinitely better. Unwaking sleep and eternal silence,—what unselfish soul would not choose them rather than a heaven with its lustre dimmed by the smoke of torment and its music broken in upon by a dreadful undertone of hopeless pain? Is this only the daring word of a radical? Not long before his death, Henry Ward Beecher, in an article in the *North American Review*, declared in burning words that no belief at all was unspeakably better than the so-called faith which had dominated the churches in the past.

We will indeed rejoice that so many of the preachers and of the churches, of all names, are now with us in the proclamation of that which is a gospel indeed. Probably most of the old creeds are cherished only as historical relics. Probably none of them would be written now. A practical way for being rid of them has not yet made itself clear. But they are gradually being outgrown. This is the way of evolution; and, though we sometimes get impatient of a process which seems slow, perhaps this is better than revolution and sudden rupture. While, then, we are so fortunately situated that logic and consistency can be our companions, let us be sympathetic and helpful toward those who are still handicapped by inherited traditions from which they find it hard to break away. Through ages of tears and blood freedom has at last been attained; and we have entered on its inheritance. Who, then, shall preach the gospel? Among others, we, if so be that we are fortunate enough to have one.

I, for one, believe with all my soul in "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." In the brief time at my disposal, I shall try to suggest—no one could do more—what seem to me this gospel's great essentials as seen in the light that shines upon us as we stand here on the threshold of the twentieth century.

I. At the outset, then, we have *a gospel of hope for this world.*

There are preachers in plenty, both clerical and lay, to whom the good times are always the good *old* times.

Paradise and the Golden Age are in the past, and we are now fallen on evil days. Chiefs, leaders, kings, nobles, as a rule, have cared little for the common people, except as they could exploit them for their own behoof. Ecclesiastics, in the main, have sided with them. Slavery, serfdom, poverty, have been accepted as of divine appointment, and so inevitable and permanent. The poor and the servile classes have been piously exhorted to be content in the position in which Providence has placed them, and to look for their compensation in another life. There is a certain kind of reformers who exaggerate the evils of our present social condition until, if we believed them and were logical, we should give up all hope of betterment; for if, after two thousand years of Christian history, the world is no better or is actually getting worse, it would look as if the universe were against us. And, if it is, there is little use in trying.

But he who takes this tone shows that he is not only disheartened or bitter, but that he is ignorant. When I think where humanity started; when I trace the lines of its advance; when I see it climbing its age-long pathway sprinkled with tears and blood; when I remember its ignorance and inexperience; when I see it swept and swayed and blinded by the passions of brute ancestors not yet outgrown; when I see it terrorized and cowed by the hosts of gods and devils created by its superstitions and fears; and then when I see what it has accomplished in spite of these; when I see it sloughing off its evils and rising into the regions of heart and brain, attaining slow but sure mastery of itself and of its conditions, I am amazed by the wonder of it all. It is so magnificent that one is compelled to feel in all seriousness that, in the light of past achievements, no hope is grand enough to be called extravagant. In another sense than that of the Psalmist, I cry out: "What is man! Thou hast made him a little lower than the Elohim,—than God."

With peering eyes and venturesome feet he has explored the heavens and made the most hidden parts of the earth familiar places. His discovery of wonderful forces is such as prophesy a natural mastery of the globe. It is not strange that the new-found immensity of the universe confounds him and stuns him into the temporary bewilderment of agnosticism. It is not strange that the sudden floods of wealth and the tremendous developments of physical force for a time overwhelm the spirit and drown the "still, small voice" of the soul. It is not strange that

socialistic dreamers should attempt short cuts to earthly paradises or start out on violent crusades for visible Jerusalems with streets of gold. All these are only muddy eddies in the onward-flowing streams of the world's advance.

Though we cherish a natural hope for all good things of which humanity can dream, we have faith in no panaceas which promise miraculous or sudden results. New religions may spring up, like "Christian Science," and promise the immediate annihilation of all evils, physical and spiritual, if we only think hard enough. Social reformers may promise the immediate abolition of poverty, while individual folly and passion and shiftlessness remain unchanged. But the kingdom we prophesy "cometh not with observation." When zealots cry, "Lo, here! or Lo, there!" we cannot go after them. Our kingdom, like the Christ's of old, is first "within," and then slowly becomes the outward expression of the inner ideals.

But instead of thinking that the world is old, is getting weary, and is hastening to its doom, we see the human race like the infant Hercules strangling the serpents which hiss around its cradle. His magnificent labors which are to cleanse and glorify the earth are still ahead of him. What has been accomplished is only promise of what is to be. Needless pain, disease, poverty, vice, crime,—all these are problems naturally solvable, and which the natural man is competent to dispose of.

All round the heavens are glimmerings of twilight, and in many places gleams of dawn. The rise of the common people, the widening of intelligence, the marvellous increase in education, the growth of a sense of responsibility on the part of the rich, the shortening of the hours of labor and so the increasing opportunities for culture, the discoveries, the inventions, the almost incredible multiplication of man's power of control over the earth's resources and the limitlessness of these resources, the countless movements of which these are hints and specimens,—all are rays of hope and promise which foretell the sunrise of a long day of human civilization here on earth. There is nothing which man needs on this planet which he is not competent to achieve. This is the first word of our gospel for the century.

II. But the word "gospel" in the past has been used almost exclusively in dealing with a man as a religious being. When I was asked to prepare this paper, I suppose I was expected to devote myself primarily to the religious aspects of my theme.

What then, is our gospel here? The entire history of the human race reveals the fact that in the past *religion has been the most characteristic, the most powerful, the most important element in the nature and life of man.*

But is this to remain so? If not, then it is hardly worth while for us to trouble ourselves about the matter. With Comte, religion is only a phase of human experience to be lived through and outgrown. Agnosticism on the part of thoughtful people is very wide-spread. Indifference and practical secularism among the money-seeking and pleasure-loving multitudes is perhaps still more common. Much of this springs out of shallow and superficial knowledge. People have been taught to think of religion as identical with certain temporary aspects and phases of the age-long religious and theological growth of the race. Coming to doubt these, they fancy that religion is discredited.

Of course theory—theology—changes as humanity grows. But a boy does not necessarily die, as,—in process or development toward manhood,—one suit after another, he outgrows his clothes. No change of astronomic theory puts out any of the stars. So the growth of intelligence, which one after another antiquates theological theories, does not invalidate the great facts of religion, which they are only devised to explain. Changes in theory and form, from the war-chief up to the republic, do not destroy government. So it is only a shallow and passing phase of thought which imagines that religion is only or chiefly a thing of the past.

The essence of religion is in the world-wide, necessary and eternal relation which exists between man and the Power manifested in the universe, both outside of man and in man. So long, then, as the universe exists and there is a man in it capable of feeling and thinking, so long religion, in the nature of the case, must remain.

Here, then, is the eternal rock on which we rest. This being so, what are the great words of our gospel message for to-day?

As already said, they can only be suggested. But let me say, once and for all that I shall take no position but such as, I believe, can be adequately supported by the best historical, critical, and scientific knowledge of the age. I must assume this, for lack of time to do anything more. But I hold myself ready to vindicate what I say at the request of any earnest and respectful inquirer.

And, first, what is the source of our gospel? What

light have we on the great religious problems of the world? My reply is a comprehensive one.

We have *all the light there is.*

We are fortunate in a freedom which permits us to walk in the illumination of any light which casts a single ray upon our path. As all light, when traced to its source, proves to be sunlight, so all truth is of God. We do not hesitate to accept with gratitude any guidance from any teacher or any land. Truth on the lips of Confucius or Gautama or Marcus Aurelius is neither more nor less true than that which is found in the words of Jesus. This is not to raise comparisons between them. We enjoy the poetry of Job, of the Psalms, of Shakespeare, or of Burns. But saying this asserts nothing as to the equality of their genius or inspiration. Are there inspirations and intuitions and insights of lofty souls? We are glad of them all. Did the speaker wear the yellow robe of the Buddhist devotee? Did he argue in the market-place of Athens or walk in the groves of the Academy? Did he muse in some Middle Age cloister? Did he dream with the Mystics? Was he a spiritual athlete and gladiator, like Luther? Was he a gentle seer, like Emerson? We are equally grateful, if so be they have some gleam of truth to make our pathway plainer or some word of courage and hope to lift up and srengthen our souls.

We are glad of our Bible and all bibles, but we believe that

> "Out from the heart of nature rolled
> The burdens of the Bible old."

And we believe that out of the same heart have ever rolled burdens and sobs and petitions and aspirations and battle-cries and songs of triumph which have made men and women masters of life and of death. Bibles do not make religion. It is religion which makes bibles.

We are aware of claims to infallible guidance, put forth on behalf of both organizations and books. But a careful study does not substantiate these claims. So our chief reliance is human experience in the light of human reason. But, as we have no infallibility, we hold that it is not necessary in religion any more than anywhere else. Indeed, it is a serious question as to whether it would do us more harm than good. What we really need is standing-ground for trust and light enough to answer all practical purposes of daily guidance. This we have.

Instead, then, of one finished revelation, given once and for all to one people, we believe in a universal and gradual and progressive revelation for all mankind. God comes into the brain as truth, into the heart as love, into the life as righteousness, just as fast and as far as human experience and development make way for him. So all the light there is, is ours; and while we hail and rejoice in the dawn, we lift up waiting and watchful eyes for that "more light which is to break forth out of God's holy word,"—whether written in book, in the heavens over our heads, on rock leaves of earth, or on "the fleshly tables of the heart" of man.

2. As one grand result of the great flood of light which has come to us during the century just closed, we are warranted in reversing our conception of the origin and nature of man. We preach, then, the glad, good news that *the world is not lost.*

A lost humanity, lying under the blighting curse of an angry God,—this is the corner-stone of the old theology. But it is commonplace to us now that the Eden story is an old Pagan legend. It was not even original with the Jews. The older prophets do not know it. If Jesus was familiar with it, he did not consider it of sufficient importance to be even referred to. Instead of "the fall of man" and "the origin of evil," it is now demonstrated, beyond any intelligent question, that we have to deal with the ascent of man and the origin of good. If the curse of human history and the present condition of man are evidences of a thwarted omnipotence, then we are face to face with the problem of an incompetent God. We must believe—if we believe in God at all—that the age-long process of human growth is a part of the eternal plan.

Evil and sorrow exist, and perhaps never have they so weighed on the brain and heart as they do now. And it is not strange that the ignorant childhood of the race should have dreamed of a devil and a fall as a way of accounting for them. But to-day these would be a greater intellectual and moral difficulty than all those which they were devised to explain. Before the epoch-making work of Spencer and Darwin, I do not see how the dreadful dilemma, so remorselessly set forth by John Stuart Mill, could be escaped. But evolution tells us a wonder-story—which has the merit of being demonstrated as true—which gives us an account of evil and sorrow, which, if it does not remove all difficulties, at least makes it possible for us to respect and trust in God and cherish a good hope for men.

We do not minimize evil, either moral or physical; but we are able to deal with it rationally and hopefully. We can foresee a day when—not as the result of propitiating the universe as an enemy, but of co-operating with it as a friend—"the low, sad music of humanity" shall sink and fall, fainter and farther away, while rising and swelling in its stead shall be heard, clearer and still more clear, the song of triumph which shall tell of "peace on earth, good will to men."

3. Along with this good news there goes the *new thought of God,* as always our Father and our Friend.

No longer outside of a world, first blessed and then blighted, issuing arbitrary edicts and meting out capricious rewards and punishments, we have come to think of him as the mind, the heart, the soul of his universe. Immanent and yet transcendent, the world is visibly in process as he, its life, lifts and leads. The forces of nature, acting in accordance with unchanging laws, are God at work, are tokens and signs of the present and active divinity. The changelessness—which many think of as hiding or denying him—is only the eternal faithfulness of him "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Because he changes not, knowledge is possible,—as otherwse it would not be,—and man can grow into intellecual, moral, and spiritual manhood. Because he loves us, we suffer as the result of our mistakes and passions, and through suffering learn the laws of life.

If anyone is inclined to challenge our right to preach a gospel of Theism at all, I can only say now—for there is time only for hints—that I believe the position is a defensible one. Under the leadership of "star--eyed science," I think we may tread a pathway which leads "through nature to God." Herbert Spencer tells us that the one most certain item of all our knowledge is the existence of an infinite and eternal Energy from which all things proceed; a Power back of all phenomena, and of which phenomena are but changing and passing manifestations. This force manifests itself as life, consciousness, personality. And as a stream cannot rise higher than its source, and as nothing is evolved which was not first involved, it follows of necessity that the Power which manifests must be at least equal to that which is manifested. So this infinite and eternal Power must be at least as much as life, consciousness, and personality. To refer to Mr. Spencer once more, he said to me in conversation one day that there was no reason why we should not think of this in-

finite and eternal Power as being as much above and beyond what we mean by personality and consciousness as we are above and beyond vegetable growths.

This, you see, is a grandly positive position, and not at all a negative one. We proclaim, then, a God, above all disorder and caprice, holding the worlds in his hand, and yet our Father and our Friend.

4. In that which has been called the gospel in the past, *Jesus* has been the central figure. From our point of view what is to be his position and power in the religious life of the coming century?

I believe that his office is to be twofold. As the divinest man so far, in the evolution of the race, he naturally becomes for us the highest revelation of God. As the divinest man so far, in the evolution of the race, he equally becomes for us a natural revelation of the ideal and coming man. He is not a complete revelation of God, and he may not be a complete revelation of man. As God can put more of himself into a higher form of life than he can into a lower one, so, naturally, he can put most of himself into a man, who is the highest development of earth life. It is, then, purely a natural fact—though none the less divine—when we see "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." And, on the other hand, in the highest specimen of man so far developed we have a natural illustration of what humanity essentially is and actually is to become.

With infinite pains and patience, scientific criticism has sifted the dust-heaps of the ages. Legends and traditions have been traced. History has been more carefully studied. We have learned how religions and bibles grow. This criticism has sometimes been thought to be cold-blooded. It has been regarded as the enemy of the heart, the destroyer of reverence and devotion. But at last the world is waking up to the fact that truth only is sacred, that an old mistake is no better or holier than a new one, and that, in the time of the world's ignorant childhood, mistakes were easy and common.

Instead, then, of denying Jesus, as is sometimes charged against us, we are really finding him, and learning to love and honor him as has never been possible before. As an artist removes the grime, the dust, the well-meant whitewash from some long-lost but newly discovered portrait, until the perfect likeness looks out again and rewards his loving patience, so the tireless labor of the truth-loving critic is at last rediscovering the lost likeness of the great radical leader and reformer of Nazareth.

For ages it has been claimed, not only that he belonged specially and peculiarly to the old theology, as being both its central figure and its intellectual author, but that those who did not admit his claim denied the plain record of his life and did wilful despite to his spirit. But it is found, at last, that he teaches not one single point of the old theology, and that its whole representation of the character of God and the condition of man is a flat contradiction of his authentic words and his tender and loving life.

We do not claim that we can rationalize the record completely. We do not feel bound to explain how all wonder-stories spring up and grow in distant places and remote ages. But we have got near enough to the great figure so that we can hear the heart-throb and feel the pulse-beat. We now know not only how great, but how intensely human he was. We recognize the God in him as akin to the God in ourselves,—however much the divine in him transcends that which is as yet in us,—and so he becomes not only human brother, but leader and inspirer as well. He was never so near to the heart of the world, and never so able to touch it with a power of rebuke, of sympathy, of help and hope, as he is to-day.

We are not the ones who turn our backs upon the real Jesus. Indeed, we claim him as peculiarly our own. The lonely martyr to a new and grander truth than his generation was ready to receive, contemned and outcast by those who claimed to be the peculiar and special representatives of God, have we not the right to believe that, were he living to-day, he would be found with those who are trying to lead this age out of the ignorances, traditions and superstitions of the past into an acceptance of the newer and higher revelation which is challenging the intellects and the consciences of this twentieth century?

An ignorant, credulous, bigoted, and superstitious age, cherishing a degraded conception of humanity to which nothing high was naturally possible, thought to honor him by a process of deification. This doubtful tribute he shared with no end of pagan heroes, and with even the most disreputable of the Roman emperors. This sort of thing was in the air of the age. Out of the turmoil of struggling, ambitious, cruel and bloodthirsty priests and bishops and rulers the gentle Nazarene at last emerges, transformed into an amorphous being, neither complete god nor man. His wonderful tenderness and pity were made sponsors for a doctrine of God which turned the infinite and eternal love into an infinite and eternal horror.

It is the beauty and glory and hope of this age to recover Jesus once more, and to heartily accept his simple teaching that his Father is our Father, and that all men are borne on the bosom of the infinite patience and the infinite love.

We preach, then, the gospel of Jesus,—the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the coming of the divine kingdom here on earth. We see in his face the glory of God, and in his life the prophecy of the divine incarnation as progressively revealed in the race,—which is God's beloved and eternal child.

5. Another message of our gospel is *a new ideal of human duty*. The service of God and the service of man are one.

In the old days to serve the king might not be at all to serve his subjects. So in the old supernaturalism there was a double standard of conduct, not yet outgrown. To make it clear, let us recall a somewhat famous statement of Mr. Dwight L. Moody. He said in one of his sermons, "Morality don't touch the question of salvation." This bold utterance struck many people as monstrous. Indeed, it shocked some of those who were in general sympathy with him. Yet, on the basis of the old theology, it was perfectly logical and consistent. In fact, it was an inevitable inference from first principles. Look at it in the light of a parallel case. Suppose a citizen of Russia becomes a Nihilist or deliberately rebels against the czar. He is a traitor and, from the governmental point of view, worthy of death. When brought up for trial, suppose some advocate should argue that he was a good husband and father, that he paid his debts, that he was a kind neighbor,—in short, that he was every way a good man. Would he not be forcibly and rightly reminded that all this was quite consistent with his being a traitor, and that his morality did not touch the question of his salvation from the death sentence that followed treason? On the old theory, men, all men, were guilty of high treason; they were rebels against God. They may be ever so good, in the earthly sense of the word, and yet be worthy of eternal death.

As a result of this, the common ideas of goodness become contradictory and confused. Bad men, suddenly pardoned, go to heaven; and good men, under sentence as rebels against God, go to hell. This is inevitable under the old scheme. Not only so, but the consciences of people are bewildered and troubled. Tradition forbids or sanc-

tions a hundred things which are neither good nor evil as related to the real welfare of men. Sunday observance or eating meat on Friday becomes quite as important as truth or honesty. And, as people are naturally more afraid of an omniscient and omnipotent God—who for offences against him is able and willing to send them to hell—than they are of men,—whose good or ill opinion may frequently be safely ignored,—it inevitably follows that they care less for what is good for this world than they do for trivial rites and ceremonies, which are of no human value, but which they suppose that God has commanded.

But now all intelligent people are set free from these confusions and contradictions. We have found out that there are no arbitrary commands of God. His laws are the real, the constituent, the vital laws of life, those which constitute the nature of things. Churches, rites, ceremonies, duties technically called religious,—these are important, if they help us to live rightly in our relation with our fellow-men. If out of relation to life, they are empty and void and vain. Nay, they may be injurious and harmful if they become substitutes for right living; and they are worse than vain, if, as is sometimes the case, they be treated as more important than character and conduct.

We have discovered anew—in the light of the scientific study of human civilization—that God's laws are a unit, and that, when we are in right relations to our fellow-men, we are in right relations to God. Duty to God and duty to man are one. Discovered anew, I said. Yes, for this is the plain and emphatic teaching of Jesus, though in his name it has been so long contradicted or ignored. Read anew the Sermon on the Mount, particularly those wonderful words (Matt. v. 23, 24), where he makes right relation to our fellow-men the absolute condition of any acceptable coming to God. Henceforth, then, to all those who care to walk in the clear light of God's truth, we are serving God when we are serving men; and those who are willing to injure men cannot possibly be true servants of God. The practical path of religion, then, is a plain path, a highway cast up and made straight, along which the feet of wise and simple may walk, finding that light of God illumining it which "shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

6. The last and crowning word of the gospel which the twentieth century needs is *immortality*.

Buckle, the famous author of the "History of Civiliza-

tion," has said, "If immortality be not true, it matters little whether anything else is true or not." If we are not quite ready to indorse so extreme a statement as that, at least we can turn it about and say, It does not much matter what else is true, if only the truth of our immortal hope may be established. For this would mean that there is to be time and opportunity for the correction, the readjustment, the consummation of all things.

If it be true that this is only the primary school of our race, and that death is but the passage on and into the next grade, and that all souls—through no matter what of necessary sorrow and discipline—are to be trained and developed into all of which they are naturally capable, then all problems of disease and pain and evil are solvable. Tennyson sings,—

> "I can but trust that good shall fall
> At last—far off—at last, to all,
> And every winter change to spring."

Given the reality of our immortal hope, and this "trust" of the poet becomes substantial fact. Then, with Browning, we may say:—

> "There shall never be one lost good! What was, shall live as before;
> The evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound;
> What was good shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more;
> On the earth the broken arcs; in the heaven a perfect round."

THE GOSPEL FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY REV. JAMES H. ECOB, D.D.

What is the gospel? Let us content ourselves with the simple root idea. Good news, a joyful message. If we go farther afield for a definition, we shall have the longer journey for our pains, and nothing more. Good news for the human soul, for your soul and mine. What is the gospel? At first, I found myself looking narrowly at that word "news." It has come to have an air of the extemporaneous, the extraordinary, the surprising. But, when you consider the human soul, that timeless, unchangeable child of God to whom the message is delivered, the content of the message can never be anything but that which is eternal. The eternal is the only new thing under the sun. It is no news to the sea that the tides will be on time. Yet the unfailing tides are newness of life to the sea. It is no news to the century oak that spring will kindle its roots with perennial thrill, yet every hidden thread and fibre stirs to meet the awakening spring. Health is no news but law. Yet health is forever decking itself with freshness and glow and beauty like "a bride adorned for her husband." Gospel soul-news from the heart of the universe is not a morning's gossip over a last night's accident. It is that pulsation from the heart of the infinite and eternal which as just now, with your present breath, made you conscious of your eternal sonship in the Divine. What is the gospel, the good news for this day? It is the old, the unfailing, the ever-coming dawn. So God forever "makes himself an awful rose of dawn" upon the soul. He is the "eternal gospel."

Does the soul need anything new? If it were a mushroom, it might need last night's shower on this morning's chill. But, being eternal, its one need is for its own. Everything after its kind. The tides for the sea; the cosmic round of seasons for the tree; the dawn for day; the eternal God and Father for the soul. The passing of our hand-breadth of years, a century, is but a heart-beat of the universe. In that pulse of the infinite heart your life is sustained and vanished. It is life, not simply living. Life is one, the same yesterday, to-day, forever. Pharaoh's

mummied body was nourished by food, his soul by the elemental and eternal. Love is love even there and everywhere. When the explorers among ancient tombs came upon a child's body, and over it this inscription, "Oh, my life, my love, my little one," every father's heart gave a great sob and again the stones were wet with tears where father's tears had fallen three thousand years before. "The thing that hath been is that which shall be, and there is nothing new under the sun."

We men who have just set foot upon this century need not run this way and that, crying Lo! here, and Lo! there, like explorers in a strange land. Life has not changed its constitutional habit to suit our almanac. The world will not suspend or change its cosmic way of doing things because we have begun to say twenty instead of nineteen. The best news I have for you this day is that God is God, and we are his children. And, if I were appointed to declare a gospel to the principalities and powers in the seventh heaven, I could do no otherwise. You, the child, ensphered in the eternal Father-love tell me, is there a higher truth conceivable by men or by angels? Is there a truth that finds at such a depth? Is there a truth that so kindles and uplifts as with wings? Will any century of any world get beyond the horizon of that truth? That is the zone of the universe, God and his child. There is nothing outside of it. And all within is held in order and strength by it. You and I are children of the twentieth century. We are the twentieth century. When we have answered the question, What is the best news to me? we have found the gospel for the century. Now come with your heart up to date in all the wisdom and folly and mystery of this last day of the world, and answer me truly, What word solidifies, clarifies, and unifies your knowledge; what word rebukes and chastens and corrects your folly; what word cries like God, through the darkness and chaos of mystery, "Let there be light"? Is it not Father, my Father? Come with the very latest twentieth century riddles and misgivings and revelations and prophecies, and visions and despairs. And this one word, old as eternity, new as the day, will answer your soul, deep unto deep, Father. Perhaps you are walking alone in the fields, and the new yet old soul-homesickness burns like desperate hunger in your heart. Like a child in the night, you cry: Who am I? What is my life? Why am I faring onward in a path which I have not chosen and leads I know not where?

"Alike for those who for To-day prepare,
And those that after some To-morrow stare,
A Muezzin from the Tower of Darkness cries,
Fools, your reward is neither Here nor There!

"Why, all the Saints and Sages who discussed
Of the Two Worlds so learnedly are thrust
Like foolish Prophets forth: their words to scorn
Are scattered, and their mouths are stopt with Dust."

"I came like water, and like wind I go.

"Into this Universe, and *why* not knowing,
Nor *whence*, like water willy-nilly flowing;
And out of it, as wind along the waste,
I know not *whither*, willy-nilly blowing."

"Earth cannot answer, nor the seas that mourn
In flowing purple, of their Lord forlorn;
Nor heaven, with those eternal signs revealed
And hidden by the sleeve of Night and Morn."

You and I, children of the twentieth century, have stood just there under empty heavens, in the engulfing loneliness, the light gone out of the sun, ashes, gray as time, fallen on the green of the earth, and all the sounds of life dropping away into minor and silence. What word has suddenly broken into the desert and solitude of that soul-homesickness and rekindled the sun, and rehabilitated the grass and the trees in living green, and put laughter and song again into the heart of the world? Father, my Father how futile are all our sciences against this cry of the homesick soul! Our wisdom has only made the universe so big and strange that we cannot live in it. Three hundred millions of worlds! Think against that, will you? You might as well strike the Himalayas with your fist. And how like an east wind to famine is all our dreary theological lore! It simply adds cold to hunger. We have not by searching found out God. The trees do not search for the sun. They live and move and have their being in him. So we live in the Father. To know God by life is like knowing health by being well. That knowledge is final. The way out of the deserts of our own sciences, the way out of the involutions and despairs of our theology is by that one word, Father.

But we must bear in mind that the gospel of that word is not simply "a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument." In such a universe as this Father-love can be no mere wanton good nature. The austerities of law must be in it. The child must not be pauperized in such a universe by maudlin,

nerveless affection. We are learning even in our street charities that to give sentimentally at the front door is to make beggars for the back door. Much of the divine Father-love preached is no gospel, but a wholesale pauperization of the world. I expect my Father to give his angels charge over me in paths of obedience. But, if those same angels are charged to snatch me up lest I dash my foot against the stones in the paths of disobedience, not only are the angels stultified in their heavenly mission, but my feet are saved from stone-bruises to run all the harder in the way of the transgressor. The greater you make your universe, the greater exactitude and imperative must you read into its law and order. The greater your Father, the greater his strenuous purposes and masterful ambitions for you. The law of divine Father-love is relentless as death. If the death of Jesus Christ means that your Father would taste death rather than see a fault in you, then it means more than all "plans of salvation" or doctrines of atonement. This, after all, is the deep note of gospel in the divine Father-love. God, the Father, will have his own. He will get us over into the greatness of his own life at whatever cost of labor and travail to us. Thanks be to God, he will not spare for our much crying. As for sin, he will break our hearts outright if we cannot learn the beauty of holiness otherwise. And to this we say Amen with a deep and solemn joy. For a century that has begun its life without any hells, to speak of, this necessary, eternal austerity in the divine Father-love may well be hailed as the deeper truth.

Another note of gospel in the divine Father-love which this halting, peering age of spiritual homesickness needs is the truth of the responsibilities of God. It is high time that the responsibility for this earthly scene should be placed where it belongs. I know of no more profoundly just demand than that the limits of my individual responsibility be defined. I am not responsible for myself. I am a child. No being shall thrust upon my puny shoulders the weight of responsibility for myself. You might as well say to the baby in its cradle, There, you are safely introduced to this big world, now shift for yourself. I will not let God thrust me a new-born, shivering soul into this awful great universe, and then calmly retire, saying, There, sink or swim, survive or perish. Remembering the old Persian adage, "the cry of the orphan shakes the throne of God from side to side," I would cry through the spaces so mightily and persistently after such a God that

for very shame he would come back and take up his child. I say deliberately to the power or powers that brought me here: Let it be distinctly understood, I am on your hands. You brought me here without my knowledge or consent. You painted me black or white or yellow, without considering my preferences or taste. You placed me high or low according to your pleasure. You take me hence at such time and in such a way as you please without consulting me. In the name of the eternal justice, then, I am your business, not my own. Friends, I verily believe that much of the lost joy of my life would be restored if we could rest our souls back hard upon this simple, inalienable demand of justice,—God responsible for us. He is bound to see us through. He is bound to make the most and the best of us. He is bound to put the best of his universe at our service. If this bill of rights could be read to the soul in some parliament of the world, how much needless pain of conscience, how much perplexity, mystery, and foreboding would pass from human life! In the consciousness of this mighty affirmation, God responsible for us, something of the child's happy *abandon* and spontaneous joy might come back into your life and mine. Now the gospel and triumph is that divine Father-love rests down upon this great eternal basic fact of justice. The Father not only recognizes responsibility for his child, but takes that responsibility with overflowing, abounding heart. The law of right is fused last in the gospel of love. Love is the fulfilling of the law. Who so responsible for your child as you, but who so loves that responsibility as you? In this one word "Father," we come to the one all-embracing affirmation which is beginning to be heard like the murmur of an incoming tide. Both the law and the gospel of this universe ours by birthright. This flower is mine, "root and all." So is the world-process mine, its roots taking hold on nether mysteries which eye hath not seen, its blossoming head towering in mid-heaven full of fruits and blossoms, and the souls of men lodging like birds in its branches. Whatever it is, solid fact or breath of spirit, law, force, atom, constellation, it is ours, "root and all," because we say, Father, to the immanent God who is "in all, through all, and over all blessed forever." This is the vision and final affirmation of that ancient seer. "All things are yours: the world, life, death, things present, things to come; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Now pluck the twentieth century like a flower out of its

cranny in the wall of time, and hold it there in your hand, saying over the poet's words, "If I knew you, root and all, and all in all, I would know what God and man is." With all my soul I cry to you, You do know, you do know. All is affirmation. God and man are Father and child.

Again, I say to you children of the twentieth century, come with all the world's very latest wisdom and agnosticism, its new thought and old, its manifold problems, its prophecies which allure or frighten us; and, if you can say, My Father, with a child's heart, at once the child's direct vision and freshness of spirit and native joy are yours again, yours to abide with you. In that word is life, eternal life.

But some man is saying, What is this but old individualism, each man alone with his God? I devoutly hope it is; for who has discovered gospel anywhere else, either in philosophy or fact? The race cannot get good news without me, for without me it is not a race. I cannot get good news without the race; for I am vitally one with it. Whatever happens to the race must happen through its individuals. You cannot have a happy race with one unhappy soul in it. You have a happy race minus one. The happiness of the race is lowered by the quantity and quality of the unhappiness in that one. The life of the forest is lowered by a worm-hole in one leaf. How will you have a strong battery without strong cups? How will you have a strong regiment without strong men? Beware of the sophistry in all collectivisms and solidarities. When I send you alone into the divine presence, and then you look straight into God's face saying, My Father, the moment you look into a human face you must say, My brother. Instantly you are a good neighbor, a good citizen, a good cosmopolite. The life of the round world is sweeter and saner and gladder because of you. Given the righted individual, and the solidarities will take care of themselves. All that the nation needs is good citizens. All that society needs is good members. All that the family needs is good fathers and mothers. We have political economies, socialisms, populisms, and what not because we have bad citizens, men who say neither Father to God nor brother to man. Our doctrine of divine Fatherhood and therefore human brotherhood is not only the eternal gospel, but it is a final philosophy. Can there be any other gospel than a true and therefore final, eternal philosophy of life? When I have found the secret of right living, I am centred in beatitude. All news is good news to the good man. "In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly."

Here is the wisdom of the child. The Master of us all, the eternal Son of God, came into the world solving all problems by his one comprehensive formula, "My Father and your Father." That is the light which lighteth every man coming into the world. The sun sees all his planets forever on the illuminated side. The divine Father-love holds your soul, your world, in its luminous comprehension. If there is a shadow of turning, it is not in him. The shadows of his creatures are but the shadows of themselves upon themselves, and it is because they are immersed in the eternal light.

THE MINISTER'S ADJUSTMENT TO THE NEW CONDITIONS.

BY REV. WILLIAM C. GANNETT.

One who dwells much on the newness of conditions is apt to miss the essential part of the conditions—their centre. The first thing to say on this subject of mine is that the minister of to-day and to-morrow has to be centrally the same kind of a man that he was yesterday and has much the same work to do as he then had. It is his to interpret Nature and Life in their spiritual aspects, and his to inspire men to live the life of the spirit. To interpret and to inspire those were, and they are, the two functions the minister tries to fulfil. And the mysteries of the universe are still mysteries; the problems of life and of death are unsolved; evil is still here to baffle and stimulate us; human nature, with its weakness, its glory, and its needs, is still human nature; temptation is as old as it is new; sin is still sin,—the fall of the man, when he might, had he willed it, have risen; the Moral Law is still sovereign, and salvation and joy on the one hand, retribution on the other, still testify to it; self-surrender is still self-possession, and self-sacrifice still self-development; the Sermon on the Mount holds good; faith, hope, and love still are "these three" and "abide," and the greatest of these still is love; the Christ-life and Paul-life are still types of the highest life; no name for God better than "Father" has been found, unless we intensify "Father" to "Mother"; and the faith fundamental in God is still faith in Goodness. These are the central things,—all of them old. These are the minister's field of interpretation, and the source of his power to inspire; and these last through from one era or type of civilization to another.

From one area of civilization to another,—in that phrase lies hint, after all, that the conditions of to-day are new. It is quite possible that men speaking of 1900 may by and by say, "Then began the second century of the new Christianity." What will they mean if they do? This,—that in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries the imperial, classic civilization of the Mediterranean basin gave way to a feudal, Catholic civilization and re-

ligion which spread over Europe and lasted a thousand years,—this the first Christian dispensation; that in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries this mediæval civilization in turn began to give way to new influences of Renaissance and Reformation, and that again for the readjustment of elements three or four centuries of tumult were needed; that, in religion, the revolt from Rome, the Protestant splits and re-splits, the religious wars and persecutions, the growth of toleration, the early sporadic assertions of freedom for reason and conscience, were all parts of this readjustment. The year 1800 arrived. The American and French Revolutions in politics and the rationalistic movement in faith were heralds of the new type of civilization soon to appear; but the new synthesis, social, intellectual, religious, had not really begun in 1800. Not until two-thirds of the nineteenth century had gone by did men realize that a new heaven was growing over their head and a new earth under their feet. Not until then did the new brood of sciences born in the first fifty years of the century, the new industrial system forced into being by steam-power machinery, the new democracy emerging from the old monarchies, and the great mid-century conceptions called correlation of forces and evolution,—not until then did these mighty agencies, social, political, intellectual, religious, working together, accomplish the change, end mediævalism, and inaugurate the new dispensation. So that the men of 1900 may be fairly enough said to begin the second century of a new era.

If anything like this be true, then, whatever abides, whatever is old, in the minister's function and field, he is certainly confronting new conditions. Happy the young men and women who are facing to-day the life beautiful of ministry, conscious that they are the "Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp" of a new revelation, with the martyrdoms not yet over, the best of its Bible to write, and a new religion to explore, interpret, and establish on earth! It is theirs to interpret the universe in its spiritual aspect, I said. Theirs, then, to wed the sacred and secular, and to see and show God in all things. Theirs to proclaim that, if spirit be matter, matter is thereby proved spirit, that Freedom is Mothered by Fate, that Love is the soul-side of Law, and Evil the shadow which could not be save for Light. Because never before was the universe so illimitable, so eternal, so subtile, so thrilling and surging with Life as it is to the mind of to-day amid the new environ-

ment which science has opened around us, therefore never before was theology so majestic awaiting interpreters; for theology is but science written in alphabets of the spirit.

A nobler theology, then, translated out of Nature,—that is part of the joyous task of the new minister. And even more awing and humbling his service than this; for his it is, also, to interpret the indwelling God of the soul. Under our new conditions the old Bible drama of revelation is becoming a poem of the past, taking its place among the Eddas and Vedas of the child-soul of the race. As source and seat of authority in religion, Sinai hath been removed and cast into the sea, and Bethlehem-Nazareth lost from its niche in the hills. Lacking them, the new minister's part is to explore the secret places of the Most High within the recesses of conscience, the dark glens of motive, the inner hilltops of vision, and learn there for himself whatever he may of the God who is never *not* in communion with man; and, when he has surprised revelation himself, then his to come back and proclaim it with might, and convince men that they, too, can surprise it, and that very God is in them. How little we know as yet of the blood in its coursing, how little of nerves and their currents of force, although only by these do we live and move and have being! How less than little we know of the course that the Spirit takes in us and the ways of its springing, although by its rise and its flow in us we are all that we are! To-day glimpses of unguessed organs in human nature are startling us, till no wonder we talk of the "occult." Under the new conditions of knowledge the Bibles return into literature, and a deeper psychology, the spring of all scripture, is opening before us. And again the minister, he of the new equipment, stands in the band of interpreters.

A grander theology, a deeper psychology, and one other enrichment,—an ampler and truer sociology,—that is the third phase of the new dispensation. It is, perhaps the one most to be emphasized. Justice and brotherhood brought men together in the dawns of society and successive expansions of justice and brotherhood have constituted what we name stages of progress. But truly it seems as if never, except possibly when the spirit of Buddha five centuries before Jesus stirred India and possibly when the spirit of Jesus himself stirred the Mediterranean lands for a while,—as if never but then and there had the spirit of justice and brotherhood so mightily surged in the hearts of men as to-day. I say it, not forgetting the overturn of

America's ideals by the Philippine slaughters of men who are most like ourselves in their love and striving for liberty, not forgetting England in Africa, not forgetting the crush of vast standing armies abroad, not forgetting the corruption of law-makers whom we ourselves vote into power, nor the increasing unevenness of the distribution of wealth, nor the manifold deviltry which each morning paper reports. Remembering these things, and more, still we are conscious of outweighing truth in the claim that "we are living to-day in a sociological age." The rise of democracy, the new economics, the widening reforms and philanthropies, the exaltation of woman, the gathering strength of the unions of labor, the new "socialism" in which we all share more or less; in religion the change in the aim of salvation from personal to social, and in the sphere of salvation from heaven to earth, and in the plan of salvation from methods that would fain save the soul to methods that endeavor to save the whole man,—body, mind, heart and soul,—such signs as these (and their number is legion) attest that the prayer of our lips, "Thy kingdom come," is getting down to our hearts and through to our hands, and that the sociological dream of Jesus is at last on its way to come true. Again, what man is so fit as the minister to help interpret that dream?

So fit, if he be fitted! There is the rub. I like to ask friends who work with their hands—the barber, the cobbler, the carpenter,—how long it takes to become good at their trade. The frequent answer, in some phrase or other, is, "All one's life: there is something new to learn every day." If this be true for the barber, it is much more true for the minister whose tool is the Word, and his material the Soul with its heavens, its earth, and its hells. "How long does it take to become a good minister?" "All one's life, sir,—several lives: we learn something new every day." But speaking in the more limited way, a minister's education, if he be fortunate, comes in three parts,—in his college, in the theological seminary, and in his first parish, the first five years of his actual work. Of these,—henceforth to speak humbly, as one fully conscious that he is not the man to write on this subject, and who told his inviters so,—of these, the first and the last seem to me the more important. By all means let the minister who would fit himself for the conditions of the new day get his college, if possible,—turning back in his course, if need be, to get it. His training there cannot be too wide or too thorough. In most cases it settles both the

dimensions and the style of his whole afterwork: the style, because in the college he gathers his budget of mental habitudes,—logic, balance, exactness, directness, simplicity, grace,—gathers these under expert care; and the dimensions of his work, because it is largely the college which determines whether he shall be a two by two or a ten by ten man all his life in literature, economics and science. To answer the demands of the congregations of to-day, he needs all the knowledge in these three fields that he can possibly get; and, the larger he makes his study at the beginning, the better for him to the end. Let him remember that function of his: he is to be the interpreter of the spirit in literature, he is to lead his people to recognize "scripture" on hearing, and welcome it new from the poets and thinkers. To this end he must know and feel and love such scriptures himself. He is to interpret the new theology from the new science; and to that end the science must not be as a stranger, however little he may claim it as intimate. He is to derive the new applications of justice from the new economics. To that end he must speak with fair judgment of economics. Let him remember his competitors also. In all these interpretations he is to compete with the bright journalist, the able reviewer, the admirable magazine writer. The counsel of wisdom, therefore, to the intending minister is to lay broad his foundations in college. The minister had better be the best educated man in his parish, if he can; for there will probably be several smarter than he, not to speak of the women. From college he goes to his theological school. Is it ingratitude in ministers of twenty or thirty years' work in the field to confess that some of us think we owe more to the personality of our professors in the old Divinity School than to the subjects they taught or the methods they used? Something like that, perhaps, would be owned to by many who are not yet twenty years in the field. The schools have turned out too many good men to deserve the bitter taunts which President Hyde heaped on them two years ago at the International Council of Congregationalists. But, from the changes made by the schools in the subjects and methods during the last twenty years, it is certainly fair to infer that great change was needed. The course used to centre largely around systematic theology and Biblical exegesis, the latter depending on study of Hebrew and Greek. But why is Biblical exegesis needed to fit men to preach a religion no longer based on texts of the Bible? With the frank acknowledgment that it is not

needed, the whole study of Hebrew and Greek may fall away from the course with little loss to the student, and with great gain in time saved for studies that are of importance. Shall I make a confession which only exaggerates, I suspect, the experience of many a head better furnished than mine? In my minister work I have not had Hebrew, nor except on the rarest occasions felt any need of it. Only on rare occasions have I used the Greek saved over from college,—not a great store. Latin has now and then served me a little, but the need is infrequent. I have not even had German freely and usably mine,—a pity and shame, but for work that I found to my hand not a great deprivation. English alone, with what scholars,—for scholars there must be in the profession, if only to keep high the standards and to succor us ignorant ones,—English alone, with what the keen, kind scholars have brought over to English from those alien languages has virtually served my whole purpose, and given me vastly more light than I could possibly utilize. This experience, I repeat, is probably generic. Therein lies the only propriety of the confession. As to the Bible, the simple fact is that a man today without any Hebrew or Greek at all, or even German, to help him, can get from English alone a truer idea of its structure and contents than the best equipped scholars possessed a generation ago; and this general idea of structure and contents, with that further acquaintance that he gets from reading the English Bible as literature and history and biography, is what the preacher needs when he goes out to the people. In place of the systematic theology, that other subject in the old school course, the philosophy of religion broad-based on psychology and history, and the history of ethnic religions, will better serve one who is striving to adjust himself to the new conditions of mind. But now (if I understand rightly) it is change in just these directions that the divinity schools are fast making,—less Hebrew and Greek, less Bible, less structural theology, more of the psychology and philosophy and history of religion.

And change in another direction of major importance is far on its way in the schools. Twenty-five years ago not a divinity school in the land gave any systematic instruction in sociological lines. Our Harvard School led the way, I believe, offering her first course as an elective in 1880. Andover followed seven years later. The Hartford School, the next year, was the first to require the course. The Chicago Seminary, Congregational, was the earliest to

deem the subject worthy of a separate department with a professor to itself. This so recently as 1890. To-day many schools prescribe the course, several have the separate professor for it, probably nearly all the rest offer it as an elective. And practical field work by the students, school settlements in the slum districts of large cities, and post-graduate and travelling fellowships in sociology, all have begun. Each year the syllabus of instruction on the subject grows more elaborate and the interest of the students more intense.

And there are other recent adjustments in the divinity schools to the new conditions of ministry. Elective courses are sorting out the specialties of scholarship from the studies required of all: in Yale for instance about half the time is allowed to electives. *Seminar* methods are supplementing the lectures. And closer relations are fostered between the schools and the neighboring universities so richly provisioned for culture. In a word, the revised divinity school is beginning to turn out the revised minister. But it still would profit the schools to ask ten ministers, some twenty years out from their walls, what elements of their training have contributed most to any success they have gained, and what elements of training they have lacked that they feel would have given them greater success. For myself and for one thing, I mourn that we had no course in straight pedagogics,—I mean the art of telling a Sunday-school story, of making a point, of giving a thought tentacles by which to lay hold of attention; and I should be greatly tempted to take but two years in the school and put the third year in some kind of social settlement work, unless the school itself offered opportunity for it, as it does in Graham Taylor's ministerial laboratory in Chicago.

The college, the theological school,—but, after all, the minister's fitting for the new day or old of his work lies mainly in neither of these; it lies in the first five years of actual work in his first parish. That blessed first parish, with its patience, its forbearance, its large opportunity and necessity to practise every clause of the charity chapter; those five years of joy and of agony, when he is learning the tools of his trade with much cutting of fingers,—this is the real apprenticeship. Love, modesty, honesty, undivided devotion to work, and unquenchable hope will carry the young man through the mistakes. Let him lie low, keep still, work hard, not print, and bless the mistakes as one by one he corrects them,—that is enough; and I hurry along.

What shall he preach about during the five years, as he strives to learn the new conditions of the age and to adjust himself to them? I like old advice on this topic. I like Emerson's word in 1838, in the great Divinity School Address: "Preach first *soul*, and second *soul*, and evermore *soul*." I like Dr. Dewey's words, and the saintly face rises in mind as I quote them. "Tell me," said Robert Collyer to Dr. Dewey, eighty-seven years old, "how you would preach other than you have done if you could begin again." He pondered a moment,—his voice was broken, but his eyes shone,—he lifted his weak hand above his head, and said, "*I should try to fill my sermons more and more with faith in the eternal love, the eternal presence, and the eternal providence within the eternal laws.*"

And, for good practical sense, I like Starr King's word on this head. Edward Hale says that Starr King used to say that five sermons out of six should be simple statements of things the world needed for its improvement and of chances which those very hearers had to take hold to help. Once in six sermons, he used to allow, you might demolish orthodoxy, or reconcile free-will and foreknowledge, or bowl out the Pharisees, or explain about creation. But the real good of coming together on Sunday, according to him, was to find out what you were going to do about it all.

To adjust one's self to the new conditions of our own special day, I should add for myself, Preach the truth far more than the error of orthodox dogmas. Preach the togetherness of the churches. Preach the principles rather than the doctrines of the liberal faith,—the principles common to liberals of whatever church name. Do not denominationalize: leave that to the men of the yesterdays. Do not belong to the church supercilious, the church of the raised eyebrows, whether the brows are Episcopalian or Unitarian. And preach hope, preach cheer indomitably. It is the only thing one ought to preach, whether he believes in it or not. In all other things let him be unimpeachably honest. But, as another has said,—

"Every sermon, whatever the subject be, must be set in the major key, must look toward the regions of hope, must have the accents of ultimate victory in it."—*J. M. Jones of London, Scrap Book 5.*

Shall he preach on social issues,—on burning questions, those on which good men differ? How can he help if he is to adjust himself to the new conditions? What else is

he for if, when the prophet-need rises, he rises not with the need, folding his priest-robes around him instead? The great problems of our new day are ethical problems, not theologic, social problems, not philosophic. And no speaker in the land has such a vantage position from which to discuss as the preacher with his trusting, open-hearted audience weekly before him. Let him discuss them, as part of his trust; discuss them in love,—in love,—in fairness,—in fairness,—and in humility; but discuss them, whether or no the discussion is wanted, as part of his God-given commission. For what else did the God of ethics send him to the pulpit in 1901 but to speak in his name on the aching questions of 1901? All this, whatever the consequences. Let him carry his resignation in his breast-pocket. But nine times out of ten, nineteen times out of twenty, it will remain there till the paper grows yellow, whatever he says,—provided he speaks truth in love and lives it out loyally. For the people love the loving prophet, and honor hard honesty.

One more query concerning adjustment to the conditions of to-day. Shall the minister try to make his church "institutional"? Shall it become a beehive of philanthropic endeavors, and not a drone in the hive? Shall there be baths and lectures and classes and clubs and Fresh Air Homes and the dispensary and the employment bureau? Yes, if the minister be gifted of God as a captain of industry. Yes, and let him and the people thank God for the gift. The people will thank him, for it is certainly true that it is the busy churches that grow. And, if he have not the gift, still let him and his church remember that their work, after all, is to establish that kingdom of heaven for which they pray, and that to this end the church must harness itself to at least one practical devotion if it would bear the name church, and their pastor the name of minister "helper" in this blessed, inspiring, tragic new day of ours.

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

BY MISS JANE ADDAMS.

Of the two questions,—the church question and the social problem,—I suppose the social problem needs defining to this audience. We are all of us conscious in our hearts of not being quite comfortable in regard to our social relations. We have managed to live nearly enough up to the teachings of our youth so that most of us do not lie nor steal. Certainly, we do not do the latter. We have been carefully taught to live up to our family obligations, so that it is not very difficult for us to be considerate to the members of our own household and to fulfil the claims which the ties of consanguinity impose. But none of us are quite satisfied in regard to the fulfilment of our social obligations. We know that, in the cities where we live, thousands of people daily are overworked; that their pleasures are narrowed down to those of the appetites very largely; that they lose the consciousness of brain power because they have not adequate food for their minds. We have learned to sit down to our well-laden dinner-tables every night, conscious that within ten or fifteen blocks of us are people who have worked all day much harder than we have, and who are eating only a meagre workingman's supper. Yet we know they have something to eat, and we take our dinners in a certain peace and quiet that would be denied to us if we thought that they were absolutely hungry. But, in regard to the other things, which are equally precious, equally important to life as food itself, we know they are habitually without, that they are habitually in need. In regard to those things which come to us through books, which come to us through travel, which come to us from the stimulation of congenial companionship, all of those things which give value to civilization and give life its higher aspects,—in regard to these things, we know they are continually denied, and their thirst for them has never been satisfied.

So the social problem has come to be a matter of scruple, a matter of trouble, has come to be something which is laid upon the consciences of this generation. Perhaps we will do nothing about it. Perhaps we will fill our lives

by merely reading about it, by merely talking about it, by saying to each other under our breath that we are unhappy because we do so little. But, whether we do something adequate or whether we merely take it out in talk, the social problem to many of us remains a constant source of trouble.

We have learned to say almost calmly that the church has little hold upon the vast mass of the working people in America. If we say this, not meaning the Catholic Church, it is very largely true. When I first went to live at Hull House about twelve years ago, many ministers and other good people were always asking me, "What is the attitude of the workingmen toward the church? what do they say about it?" and I was constantly obliged to say: "They say nothing about it: it does not touch their lives. It exists in another part of the city. They do not rail against it; they do not blame it; they do not discuss it at all, unless it is noticed in some economic discussion, when it may be mentioned as one social factor."

Now the "settlement," which is a new word, a word which has been used in America but twelve years and in England but sixteen years, has come to be unexpectedly, and perhaps disastrously, popular. It meant, in the first place, a group of educated people, in the very first case university people who voluntarily settled in a working-class community, and who gave all their leisure to the social obligations of that community, who put in whatever citizenship or political activity they had, and who tried to live in this community of their own choice merely as good citizens. They were not paid philanthropists, and I hope they may never be. They were not people who had gone there after long special training. They were merely young men from the universities who had become so uncomfortable in regard to the working-class problems that they wanted to live where they could see those problems at first hand. They had no method then; and, in a sense, the settlement has no method now. They simply go into a community with no preconceived notions which they want to force upon that community. Canon Barnet, who is responsible for the first settlement and for the use of the word, makes this distinction between a "mission" and a settlement. He says that the mission goes into a community for the sake of promoting a certain idea, for teaching a certain kind of doctrine, a certain sort of life. If they are temperance people, it is to push the temperance cause; if they hold a religious belief, they try to make

converts to that belief; if they believe in the theory of the single tax, they try to convert people to believe as they do in regard to taxation. They are committed before they go; and they can always tell how many they "have reached," how many they have induced to believe as they do. Canon Barnet says that the mission will always be necessary. There will always be people who believe so intensely in regard to some particular thing that they will be burning to make other people believe as they do. It may be a far finer thing than the settlement will ever become, but it is not a settlement. The settlement is a group of people not committed to any preconceived doctrine or theory of life. They say life is greater itself than any lesson it can teach. The residents of a settlement go there to find out what the people themselves want, what it is of which they are deprived, the things which they ought to have, those which belong to other elements of the community and which are withheld from them. The lives of the residents rise and fall as the lives of that community rise and fall. They will not shut their minds to neighborhood fears and hopes, even though their minds be filled with the highest possible hopes, and the most brilliant theories of life. So you see that the attitude is an entirely different attitude from that of the mission; and its method, so far as it has one, must always be distinct from the mission method.

Now, when we ask, what have the settlements accomplished in the fifteen or sixteen years since they have been established, we are obliged to admit that the results are meagre. We are obliged to say that we never cared a great deal for practical results; that, from the very nature of the situation, we could not hope for great changes or great results; that the life must always be greater than the work accomplished; that the situation itself must always be far larger than any activities which we can hope to command to adequately minister to it; that perhaps the chief value of the social settlement is the fact that a group of people study the situation not to confirm preconceived theories; that they study it through the medium of friendship, through the medium of pity, with a sense of identification with the neighborhood. They live there; they share with the public the discomforts of the neighborhood, the streets so ill paved and cared for, so badly lighted, and with the refuse improperly removed, so that in summer the air is stifling and the death-rate high. They share many discomforts of which they knew little till they were subjected

to them year after year. And the conviction comes to them that it is needless that these discomforts should exist; that they would not exist if one part of the city was as important as another part, and if citizens of spirit and public endeavor labored for one part of a town as much as for another.

The most notable contribution that the English settlements have made—not toward the solution, but toward the mitigation of the social problem—has been that the young men have been going so vigorously into politics for any kind of social amelioration, and have demonstrated how much can be done through county councils and other political organizations. Some of the young men in Toynbee Hall, as you know, have been elected to the London county council; and through their efforts some of the worst tenements in London have been torn down, and the county council is responsible for building improved tenements for the working people in the poorer quarters of London. They have seen that the refuse is promptly removed, that the streets are better lighted and cared for, and that the board schools are brought more nearly up to the ideals of public education with which free schools were first founded,—a very humble record, and one that has no touch of philanthropy about it. It means that this group of young men in the first instance said, "We will live where there is some demand for us, some price upon our faculties, some genuine need for our activities."

When one comes to America, the achievement on the political side is perhaps less; but possibly on the social and educational side we are not behind the English. The American need is greater; for we have a way of assuming that foreigners, and at least the first generation of immigrants, are somehow alien, and not to be taken into our American life, certainly not on the social side. We stand aside from the Italian immigrant, thinking him remote and never taking the trouble to find out what the Italian immigrant thinks of us. In the early days of Hull House we once gave a picture exhibit to the Italians. Much amazed, they said they did not know that Americans liked pictures. They thought they cared only for dollars, and they insisted that we could not be Americans and have a picture exhibit. They saw none of the better-class Americans, none even of the average Americans. They lived in a colony raided at election times by politicians. They saw saloon keepers and men whose duty it was to keep the precincts in order, but they saw absolutely nothing of the

rank and file of American citizens. There are women's clubs in Chicago who study Italian history, read Dante, go into the art of Italy, but fail to know that right at their door is this very interesing colony of ten thousand South Italians, reproducing their country's habits and manners, carrying on their transplanted life with a great deal of charm and a great deal of beauty; and yet these women's clubs know nothing about them. These immigrants have hard times. They cannot adapt themselves to the climate. They lose many of their children. The men work on the railroad and contract consumption, and many untoward things happen to them, which might be prevented by a body of good citizens, who knew the laws of household and municipal hygiene, who took the trouble to learn Italian, and who had some historic and literary interest in the colony. Many of those evils might be prevented by such a body of citizens. Certainly, it is not done; and one does not clearly know why. Perhaps the settlements, as little as they have accomplished in actual reform, have made a beginning toward showing that the Italian colony was interesting, that it was possible to get something of the charm there of life as it is seen on the streets of Naples or in the fields of Sicily.

If one would take the large Russian colony on the south, one would find the same thing. The men are more quickly Americanized than the women. They improve more rapidly, and are prone to desert their wives and children. They are ill adjusted to American conditions, and yet no one comes to make a suggestion that would help to make that adjustment. These colonies are just as interesting, just as well worth while making an effort to know as is village life in Italy or Russia. We lack imagination, we have got into certain habits in our social life,—the sort of habit which induces us to invite to our houses the people who speak English, and who speak it in about the same way that we do, who have read about the same books, who have gone to the same schools, who have been to Europe about the same number of times that we have, who wear about the same clothes that we do. We change the color of our tablecloths and the shades of our candlesticks in order to get a variety in our social life; and yet here are these people full of color, charm, history, who with their new life would offer a genuine addition to our own life, and give us a type of social endeavor and stimulus. Perhaps the settlements have made a little beginning in that direction.

When we come to the subject of education, we find a curious thing has happened to settlements. In the beginning, classes are formed in science, literature, etc.; and in a little while it is found that many of these things are not worth teaching. They might be worth teaching if the students were going to spend three years in a preparatory school and four years in college after that, but not when there is a class of men before you who have worked hard all day, and who have only a margin of time in the evening, and who, if they are to be helped at all, must have something which will lift their thoughts directly. Time presses so hard, and life is so narrow! So you recast not only your methods of teaching, but more or less you recast your curriculum as you go along. A new test comes to the settlement. You drop the class in more trivial literature. You find that plays and dramas which turn on a social trick or custom will not go, but the big things come out finally. We have had reading parties in many authors which have died out one after the other, but the Shakespeare Club has gone on for ten years; and we have heard lecturers say that they cannot find in Chicago people who are better read in Shakespeare than those belonging to the Shakespeare Club of Hull House. It has held on because the plays are vital, because they deal with actual life.

A settlement works along many methods, which, perhaps, could not be evolved if the residents sat down to think them out. We lay great stress on the drama. We have a theatre, and our young people are never tired of giving plays. You can teach manners and customs to young people in a way that would never be admitted unless you were training them for a play. Once, long ago, at Christmas, we gave Longfellow's "Golden Legend;" and for two or three years after the people talked about it. What was it? It was the old struggle of good and evil, nothing more or less than the struggle going on all about us; but the audience was cheered and helped to find it dramatized and put upon the stage. One wishes the church had never dropped the drama, but that it had been an orderly development from the old Miracle Play. A great mistake was made when it was concluded to turn it over to the devil, and to call the people to whom they turned it over devilish. The residents of a settlement have a personal acquaintance with all kinds of people, and at least learn not to be afraid of a name. Two weeks ago, in Chicago, as a result of the general panic and

misunderstanding which swept all over the country, a group of Anarchists were arrested and put under lock and key. It was discovered that the people living at two settlements knew personally six out of the ten men arrested. The settlement residents did not agree with these men in point of doctrine; but they did know them personally, and had some impression of their character. They were not frightened, they were not swept off their feet, because these men were called Anarchists at a moment when the word "Anarchist" was held up for the harshest public opprobrium.

These men belonged to no church. Certainly, none of the six had any pastor who came to see if he could minister to him, no body of fellow-worshippers to whom he could turn or toward whom he even cared to look for help or sympathy. But these men did turn to the settlement with the simple request that they secure for them counsel, the right of attorney, which is the simplest right of any American citizen. We knew them, not because they were Anarchists; and we stood by them not because they were Anarchists, but because there was this basis of personal acquaintance. I am using this illustration quite conscious that it must be an unpopular illustration, as we are still so near the event to illustrate that in a crisis it is only the people who know the wretched, only the people who know the intellectually mistaken, only the people who know those who are going in the wrong way, who can be of any service to them. No matter how much you desire to be of service to a man in trouble, if you had not some previous personal acquaintance with him before the trouble, you are powerless to help him then. He suspects you.

The settlement claims as one of its methods that it does throw its fortunes in with the fortunes of the men of its own community; that it does give tangible expression to the social needs of a great many people; that day after day, week after week, and year after year, it tries to know various phases of the social problem. It offers one common centre where people of various sorts may meet and exchange views, where they may serve, not only each other, but the common purposes of the neighborhood and the common purposes of the city. Then, if one or the other is misunderstood, if the capitalist—poor man, he gets his share of abuse—is misunderstood, it is quite possible that the workingman who may have met him at the settlement may be able to stand up for him in the trades-union meeting. If the trades-union man is mis-

understood,—and, surely, he has had a hard time lately,—some scholar or citizen of repute, who has seen him and known him, may be able to interpret him, not under the name of a class, not one out of a mass of men, but as man to man.

The settlements break up the members of a class into little groups. The worst thing that can happen to an Anarchist, for instance, is to feel that all law and government are against him, for him to meet only a few men who are as bitter as he is himself. The way to keep him is to scatter him among sane and normal people, so that he shall see different aspects of life and meet people who are not imbittered.

I have been asked to say something about the Hull House Woman's Club; and, as it is a successful example of what the settlement is trying to do, it may be well to close with that. Two hundred and fifty women of the vicinity in which Hull House is situated are members of this club. It has been organized for years. They take pains to find out what they, as a club, can do, to be of service to that part of the city. They have decorated one of the public schools in the neighborhood, kalsomining the walls and hanging upon them really beautiful pictures. They have established a Mother's Club in one school, for which they regularly provide speakers, refreshment, and general social good cheer. One summer, when the ward was badly cleaned, they divided it into sections; and each one of the women went up and down the alleys, inspecting them, so that they sent in to the board of health in one month a thousand reports and complaints. Two inspectors were removed; and one member of the club, resident of Hull House, became the garbage inspector of that neighborhood. These women broke out in loud applause when they learned that, as a consequence of the efforts of this inspector and of their co-operation, the death-rate had been reduced and was steadily being lowered. They have a Social Extension Committee. They invite to an occasional evening the people in the neighborhood who, they think, are not having the sort of social life they would like to have, people who are sad, people who do not speak English, people who cannot take hold of any formulated social life. It is not easy to do this. The Irish-American woman who can talk English perfectly well, when she invites the Italian woman, crosses a gulf,—as much of a social gulf as one can find anywhere. Of course, the idea that the social gulf is one big gulf is absurd. But she

wades through her little gulf, and asks her Italian neighbor to come to the gathering because she is public-spirited and because she believes that, if social life is good for her, it should be extended to the Italian woman as well.

I recall one winter evening long ago when the Italian women did not come, but sent their husbands instead, for reasons best known to themselves. Perhaps they were afraid of being socially extended. It was not easy for the club to entertain a roomful of heavy Italian laborers; but they had refreshments, which every one could understand. One of the Italians did a number of pretty tricks, such as one sees in the streets of Naples. Another sang rousing songs. And the evening went happily. At the close one of the women of the club said to me: "I am ashamed of the way I used to talk about Dagoes. I used to say that we must move off the street because there were so many Dagoes coming in. But they are just like other people, only you have to take more pains to find them out."

That was the result of cultivation, if we take the definition that it is extended experience. It is exactly the thing we send our children to Europe for, the result we hope for when we read books about all kinds of people,—to get over the differences raised by language and national barriers and traditions, that really we may be fair-minded and may know people as they really are. And, if we can do that in one's social life, as in one's intellectual life, or if we are without such intellectual life and can do it in our social life, it is a great achievement.

A distinct impression can be made upon a neighborhood when you can get a group of some hundreds of people, with this object in view, to work together for the common good. We have between three and four thousand people coming weekly to Hull House. Say one-third or one-fourth have the desire to extend the social relation, an interest in pulling all together to make things in the neighborhood better: you get a mass of warmth and kindliness out of the neighborhood itself which transforms and changes many things which were harsh before. That, too, is a settlement method. It is the church's method, save that the church is not in contact with the mass of working-people. It has quite withdrawn from the mass of people who work with their hands. If it were to go back to the method of personal acquaintance with working-people, not with any ulterior object of trying to make men believe or disbelieve this or that it would be the same method. If you have a democratic aim you must have a democratic

method. Or you love the democracy of one because of the exclusiveness of the other.

People who live as friends and neighbors constantly find things which are alike to each other, and that those things are stronger than the things which make us different. They gradually forget the latter, and remember more and more those things which make us alike. That is what is meant when Charles Lamb says you cannot hate a man after you know him; and, if you do not know him, it is your own fault.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNCHURCHED.

BY REV. THOMAS R. SLICER.

I should greatly prefer, Mr. Chairman and friends, that my friend Charles Sprague Smith was speaking in his own person; for I certainly cannot make his address. In the first place, I do not know what he would say, though I do know his point of view; and his point of view, working as a layman with the People's Institute and people's clubs, is not exactly the point of view of the minister. I shall have to speak from my point of view, burdened as I am with the thought that you are not hearing the other man.

The topic that has been assigned to me, "The Church and the Unchurched," is a topic that has in itself a variety of meanings. There is one church that claims to be the church that can remain no church after it has made the claim; for the very fact that it makes the claim has unchurched it. It has made of it an exclusive coterie, it has surrounded it with claims that are, in their very essence, contrary to the church's life. Nor do all the churches together represent a point of union between all the people. We cannot define what the church is, except that it is an effort of human beings to get into right relations with God. They take a variety of methods of stating those relations, running all the way from the tragedy of unhappiness to the comedy of mistake. The "unchurched" are not the same people all over the world. They used to be the people who were cast out: now they are the people who won't come in. We are all unchurched people from the standpoint of the Roman Catholic Church and the National Church of England, and any imitation that may appear of that exclusive spirit in ecclesiastical usage anywhere else. But I suppose we mean by the unchurched the people who are not reached in the way that fills the church or satisfies the minister that it is paying what it costs. We have a conviction that we ministers are a very expensive luxury, and that we cannot be made really useful until we are made more expensive, as I hope to show you before I get through. The fact is the churches ceased to be a safeguard of destiny, and to many among the peo-

ple it has not yet become a fit instrument of discipline. It does not guarantee anything in a way that leads to an investment, and it does not discipline anything in a way that makes people afraid. The church that claims to have "the key of heaven" is half the time afraid to try if it fits the lock, and so allows itself to have a lose pastorate over people who do not believe in its doctrine in many cases.

Now I suppose that, as Unitarians, we are in the best possible condition to rectify the mistake in the social condition that we mean when we speak of the Church and the Unchurched.

In the first place, we have no hard-and-fast line, so that anybody who is unchurched may dread, like Remus, to offend against the god Terminus; for that was the sin of Remus for which Romulus slew him: he jumped over the line. We are able to move our line. If any one wants to come in, we will take down the wall if necessary. We are absolutely inclusive with those who desire to enter the church under the conditions of our ministry, but the conditions themselves are difficult.

In the first place, the minister is at a disadvantage, by the very fact that he is a minister, in going to the so-called unchurched. He belongs to a class. We have lost so many people out of the church that he is discredited by people outside who do not belong to the lowest, and who fear to come in lest they should be lost themselves. One man who wanted to come into the congregation over which I preside was argued with by his wife: "You are fifty years of age, and have never been into a church. Why should you go into a church and lose your character?" He was a most noble man, and she was an admirable woman. Somehow, it had been ingrained into them that people went because they were afraid. That was a mistake on her part; and he corrected it by coming, and seems pretty well, and certainly has not lost standing in the community. But the minister is at a disadvantage. The limitations laid upon the minister of religion in the effort to get at people are in exact inverse ratio to the claim that they can get at people. The moment he pretends to have a short and easy method, that moment he is discredited. He is at a disadvantage. He goes into a group of people who are not in the habit of going to church, and they run over in their minds the extinct species with which they may classify him. There is only one remedy,—for him to get out of the ministry of religion or put himself into the ministry of religion by leading the common life, the life of every-

body else. We are to be congratulated as ministers of religion that we belong to a church which, so far as it is possible to remove the disabilities that attend upon the sacred calling, is gathering in those who belong to the great crowd of work-day people. We are to be congratulated upon belonging to a ministry that has this axiom,—that whatever is fit for a decent man is fit for the Unitarian minister. [Applause.] It removes something of the difficulty.

But the difficulty is really in another sense. The minister is expected to try to recruit his own services by drag-net tactics, in order that he may fill the vacancy of the pews that confront him on Sunday. Of course, they do not know that it is not the business of the minister to fill the pews on Sunday. The business of the minister is to fill the people that sit in the pews; and the minister who starts out to earn his salary by filling the pews has mistaken his mission entirely both in his relation to the souls he serves and the God who commissioned him. It often happens that the minister who does not think of getting a crowd gets a crowd; and then he has the most difficult problem of any human being,—to know what to do with them. For a church gathered in that way is a perfect illustration of the net that is cast into the sea and gathers fish of every kind, and some of them are not food fish. Down on the coast of Rhode Island, with which I am familiar, they cast a net into the sea in the spring; and there is no trouble in getting the fish, but there is trouble in sorting them. Some of them are fit for food, and some are fish that they put on the fields to enrich the soil; and the crops are better because they come out of the sea.

The Unitarian ministry is fortunate also in this particular,—that, in its work for the unchurched, it is not trying to recruit its numbers of worshippers simply. We are happily not troubled by that insistence on the part of our congregations. We are required to speak the truth, and to speak it every time; to live the common life; to know something of sociology as well as theology, preferably sociology; and to do the best we can to pay the debt we owe to the past that has given us a chance to work in the field of the world. We are happy in that liberty of prophesying.

Now I ask you to consider briefly what we can do as a church or as churches; for we repudiate the term "church" as exclusive, and speak of ourselves as the Congregational churches of the Unitarian faith. What can we do? I point out a few things.

In the first place, men are unchurched, through the whole range of society down to the criminal classes, because they are not interested. A man is not much to blame for not going where he is not entertained or interested. I have known extremely good people, church people, that could not rise to the height to which George Herbert rises when he said that "God sometimes takes a text, and preaches patience." The fine discipline of going into the church and throwing one's self heartily into the worship without a reference to what the preacher says, provided he does not talk nonsense and is of good character, is difficult: that fine attitude is not given to many people to reach. Most people insist that they shall hear something that is worth while or shall be led into worship that leads somewhere or shall go out as those girded by new strength. And, while it is entirely wrong for them always to expect all that,—and it would be entirely right for them to be in their places, although they hate the minister in the pulpit, provided he is right in his character,—still the rule prevails that people do not go where they hate themselves after they go away. Now the remedy for that is, so far as I know it, that we must have a kind of preaching and a power of conducting worship which shall rise to a point which inspires reverence and where it wins as instruction. I go from church to church in vacation, usually not of our own way of thinking, because I like to see what the other man sees; and I go away with my eyes aching because I cannot see that he is seeing anything particular. I strain my eyes in the direction that he is looking, but I do not see; and the preaching, as a rule (I say it with brotherly deference), is dreadfully thin,—little emaciated sermons, little anæmic discourses. I have known it to happen in our own communion that a poor little evaporated essay was laid upon the desk while the recording angel took a vacation. I think that we have much to answer for, so far as the impression of our gospel upon the world in concerned. We have been content so often to suppose that a pulpit essay could be a word of life. It was only extreme unction for a dying congregation. Now I do not mean written sermons. It is quite possible to write a sermon as though you believed it, and it is possible still to preach it in a grand way. Nobody illustrated that better than Phillips Brooks, and many another man of our own communion actually, as he was sympathetically and spiritually. But, in the main, people want to have things driven home.

I do not think that men lack a hearing who have anything to say and can say it directly to the people, but the great body of the unchurched are so because it is tiresome to go. They do not get a lift in the worship, and that in itself would be a substitute for a vacancy where they must remain until the sermon is concluded.

Now I think that the first thing we owe to the unchurched is to preach our very best. It is a great time to preach. There never was a better time in the world. There never was a time when it was harder to preach than now; and there never was a time when it was so worth while, because easy preaching makes hard hearing. I speak this out of the fulness of my conviction that the vocation of the minister is not confined to the church in which he serves. It is a great thing for a body of men, nominally related to these broad churches, to be able to speak what they want to say anywhere, to be in the attitude of Judge Jerome. When somebody reproached him for holding a court in a pool-room, he said: "You have mistaken the functions of the judge. The judge of special sessions is an itinerant grand jury." This is the attitude of the minister. I have found many times that the difficulty between the minister of the church and the unchurched is that he insists on firing from a rest, has not learned to shoot offhand.

We think of the unchurched as those who are below the line of social order. There are a vast multitude of these, also,—people who are not doing well, and who are not lovers of those who do well; thousands in every great city that are living by catching at life and carrying off what they catch. There is not one of them, unless he is a Turk or a Chinaman or a Jew or some such person, that belongs outside of the classes called Christian. There is not one of them but that either in his own person or in his immediate ancestry has belonged to the Christian Church; and the fearful thing comes home to us of the ineffectiveness of the church and its remoteness, its sitting aloof and speaking about things it does not understand. The terrible charge must be made that all these people, murderers, debased, thieves, have all in these thousand years slipped through the hands of the church into the slough where they lie. Perhaps they never belonged to the church, but their grandfathers and their grandmothers did some way back. In every great mass of population the people who are criminals are the people that in ages back somewhere were ruled by the cross of Christ, and that is the charge

made by the great mass of those who look on, who are not criminals, that the church is ineffectual.

Now let us see how the church can be made effective in reaching the unchurched. In the first place, it seems to me, that the church,—and this is what I mean when I say that the ministry must be made more expensive to be worth its cost,—must follow the trend of the times, and syndicate its resources. Instead of seeing how little we can give, instead of making the church the residuary legatee of our self-indulgence, letting it inherit what is left over after we have spent upon ourselves all that we can spend and enjoy, we have got to understand that the church, if it means anything, if it is the church of the living God and we are the children of the Most High, is entitled, not simply to the rental of its pews, but to levy on the income of all its parishioners. What does a man do who rents a pew? He thinks that that little bit of earthly business on his part has been money paid to the glory of God. What has he done? He has paid a price for the religious education of himself and his family. He says, "I don't sit in the pew." Then he is a foolish man, for he is paying for something he does not get. But the meaning of pew rental in the church is that people pay for being educated. They pay for spending it upon themselves. Incidentally, it supports the church and ministry; but that is the poorest account of its resources. The resources of the church are represented by every dollar that a godly man has outside of that which he needs for the maintenance of himself and his household. I lay it down as an axiom that, if we mean anything by devotion to any particular form of faith and the maintenance of its worship, then it is entitled, not simply to what we give it by way of furnishing ourselves with instruction, but it is entitled to all we have outside the maintenance of our own families and their proper support. The income of a church is not limited by its pew rental: it is represented by the assets of its constituency.

The Unitarian churches have a great task and responsibility in that line. I do not know how much they are worth as a whole, but I should say that the available resources of the five hundred Unitarian churches are at least $500,000,000 in America. Think of the millionaires you know. Add them up in your mind and see if that is not the very smallest fraction of the resources of our churches, —I do not say available resources, but assets. If the

churches had the seriousness of the Steel Combination, the seriousness of the American Bridge Company, if we had the seriousness of the Standard Oil Company, we would mass our assets that are available for making over this world by the life of God and in the name of Christ. Until we get that view of the church, it is not worth while for us to whine at empty seats; for we have not invested enough to make it a paying business. That is not pleasant to say, but it is true. We have got to stop trying to do a wholesale business on little capital. Our little bundle of moralities are as thistle-down in the summer wind in comparison with the surge and whirl and moan and turmoil of the unchurched world, for whom we are doing in comparison to their need absolutely nothing. [Applause.]

Now a final word. We may have a better understanding between the church and the unchurched. We cannot have it as an organization. There is no understanding that you can have with an organization. It is not possible to make a relation between a soul and what is called the church organization. No. You have got to carry the church around, just as they used to take the sacrament to the sick, just as the Catholic Church, with that splendid liberality which is under all its bigotry, says an Irish servant may baptize your child if you want it baptized and no priest be at hand. You have got to get the church afoot and around, bestowing itself on every living soul of us. That is what the settlements are doing. That is what Mr. Sprague Smith would tell you, if he were here, he is trying to do with the People's Institute. There is no lack of receptivity. There is no difficulty in getting the ear of the people. Of course, if a little smug ecclesiastic goes trotting around among the unchurched, they will have fun with him. They ought to. The man who advertises the fact that he has a patent that he wants to apply to a human soul, instead of showing he has a *human soul* that he wants to apply to a human soul, ought to have fun made of him, because they will be on to his patent right away.

Now look at the People's Institute in New York. That institute is not put on by the churches of New York, but by men interested in the unchurched. It is forming people's clubs of several hundred members. This group of men, who believe that they owe it to the busy people who are working all day that they shall be taught something in the evening, are simply following the example of Peter

Cooper, a Unitarian from the beginning, and all his life long associated with the church which bears the honored name of Dr. Bellows. They gather the people of the People's Institute during the week for instruction by lectures, as other institutes do. The most difficult work is the effort to bring the church to it, which is done on Sunday night. I do not know that Mr. Smith would speak of it; but I speak of it, because it is a very good illustration of what may be done in every city. You go on the platform with some familiar thought. It must be preaching, but not too preachy: they know the difference. You look out in that hall. You see a group of 1,800 people, 1,700 of whom are men. I have never seen 100 women in that audience. They are all kinds of men. They are in dead earnest. They are alert. They have much more power of endurance than the ordinary congregation. They expect you to preach an hour or charge you with trifling with the situation. Our congregations have not reached that toughness of sinew. I preach forty minutes often, and feel grieved at myself; but I never slack up at the Cooper Union. When you get through they start in to ask questions; and that is the most interesting part of the work. For one mortal hour they fire questions at you. It is a *mortal* hour for the man who is not ready to answer them. No man is allowed to make a speech. He asks a question. One night the speaker heard this from the floor: "You have proved to us the absolute connection of cause and effect. You have given to me satisfactory reasons that all effects have a sufficient cause. What is the scientific reason for calling that cause God?" That is a good question to have fired at you. Another fellow gets up, with a hectic flush of social discontent and says that, "if all men were created equal, they certainly are not equal now. Is not that the condemnation of democratic institutions?" For an hour each Sunday evening that kind of better understanding goes on. It is one of the most wholesome things that this country sees; for, in the main, the man who preaches on Sunday simply fires into the universe, and waits, perhaps some time, to see something come down. It is a great deal like firing into the dark; but in the People's Institute you know something is hit, and you are lucky if it is not you. That is the kind of work that is going on, and is well worth doing.

I should say that one class of the unchurched the minister cannot reach are the people who are indifferent. I

mean indifferent in the sense of the upper classes, so called. I suppose that the people who are in clubs prefer them to the church; and the people who load themselves up on Saturday night with so-called literature to occupy the Sunday morning at home,—these people can only be left to God and the angel Death. Perhaps their wives and families may have some influence, but the minister has very little influence with them. The unchurched are in the church also, but they are indifferent. The young, frivolous creature that decides that she will not go to the matinée because she wants to buy a prayer-book, and who goes out and gets prayers enough to last her for a year for a dollar and a half, with a nice band around them to keep them from flying to heaven before their time,—she is unchurched. So far as the serious struggle of soul constitutes the church, the church has not touched her. It has only brought her within its pale,—enclosed her among its people.

The real Christian church is the vindication of the fact that there are but two all-important things in the universe,—God and the soul. By all things that are possible, by exertions manifold, we are to build a bridge between God and the soul, not being too careful what God shall be called, not being at all careful what the soul is like. The church is to bind the soul of man to the soul of all. [Applause.]

THE RELATIONS OF SOCIOLOGY TO RELIGION.

BY FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS.

When your committee invited me to address this convention upon the topic, "Sociology," I felt some doubt as to what part of so big a subject I ought to choose. The study of society is approached by different classes of men with various motives and from different points of view. The interest which the religious mind takes in human society is naturally different from that which the business mind or the legal or the political mind takes. And all view the subject in a way which is not quite like that which most strongly appeals to a mind of scientific training and occupation.

To no one of these classes, perhaps, does sociological study offer a more varied interest than it does to men and women of liberal religious views, and, above all, to liberal clergymen. The courses in sociology at Columbia University are taken chiefly by graduate students, a large proportion of whom are drawn from the various theological seminaries. In a ten years' association with these men I have discovered that their interest in sociological studies usually springs from a relation which such studies bear to one or more of the four following subjects, namely: first, the origins and early history of primitive institutions, which repeatedly are mentioned and imperfectly described in the Hexateuch; second, the great problems of world politics in their moral aspects, including questions of territorial expansion and of the relations of strong to weak races in the struggle for existence; third, those problems of philanthropy and of moral reformation with which the clergyman is daily brought into personal contact in his parish work; and, fourth, the relation of society to the development of individual personality, to intellect and to character,—in short, to the human soul. Guided by this experience, I have thought that perhaps I could not speak to you more helpfully upon the topic "Sociology" than by touching briefly upon these four aspects of the scientific study of society, since these establish relations of common interest between sociology and religion,—between the work of the church and the investigations of the scientific student of social evolution.

The so-called higher criticism of the books of the Old Testament began with the first engagements of that long "Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom," the history of which has been told with conscientious scholarship by our accomplished ambassador to Germany, Dr. Andrew D. White. The Copernican theory of the heavens and the geological story of the earth prepared the minds of men for that wonderful conception of the universe—the theory of evolution—which was the supreme contribution of the nineteenth century to human knowledge. It was not possible for minds that had substituted a natural for a supernatural account of the origins of the earth, and of man as a member of the animal kingdom, to remain content with a supernatural account of the origins of man's moral and intellectual nature, of his social relations and political institutions. Even the origin and development of religion itself was bound at length to come within the scrutiny of scientific investigation. Nothing remained, then, but to crown the structure of scientific thought by a patient inquiry into the history of that supernatural theory itself, which science had thus displaced. If the sacred books and the unwritten traditions of the great religious systems of the world, including the Hebrew Christian tradition, were not literally written by the finger of God on tables of stone, or even dictated to men inspired, how did they then come into being? Fragment by fragment the answer to this question has been worked out by the labors of devoted scholars in every civilized land, who have drawn data from every field of philological, ethnological and historical research,—above all, from folk-lore and the comparative study of legal institutions,—in short, from the scientific study of society.

It is not for me to express any judgment upon the merits or the deficiencies, the successes or the failures, of the higher criticism in its philological or textual aspects. For that I am not competent. But perhaps I may venture to hold opinions upon various conclusions that deal with the origins of culture systems and the evolution of social institutions. No one, I think, can understand the books of the Old Testament who lacks a fairly good equipment of sociological knowledge. In saying this, I of course do not assert that the sublimity of those writings may not appeal as strongly to the imagination and their moral beauty as truly to the heart of uninstructed men as to the scholar. And there is no necessity that the boy or girl in the Sunday-school should learn in tender years the significance

of the levirate, or the meaning of Abraham's explanation of his apparent duplicity in claiming Sara one day as his sister and another day as his wife. But the moral value and the historical value of the Old Testament literature, as we have learned to recognize, are two very different things. That to which the scholar has a right to object and to which it is his duty to object is any pretence of understanding these writings as historical records by men who have not mastered the results of sociological investigation. The man who claims not only to appreciate, but also to understand, has no right to be ignorant of the fact that such a fossil as the story of Abraham, imbedded in the deep strata of Hebrew folk-lore, is proof absolute, even in the absence of any other evidence whatsoever, that the Hebrew patriarchal system, which for centuries has been accepted as typical of the origins of the great social institutions of the family and the State, was a very late product of Hebrew social development and not its primordial form. No man could say, "She is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother," in explanation of the fact that he could rightfully marry his half-sister, except in a community which cherished the tradition of descent traced through mothers rather than of descent traced through fathers. In the metronymic clan —that is to say, the clan in which descent is reckoned in the female line—a man sometimes may lawfully take to wife a half-sister on the father's side, because such a relationship is not counted a relationship at all. The story of Abraham, then, like many another folk-tale, has a meaning for the student who is familiar with sociological origins which must be lost to other readers.

While thus the student of the Old Testament who would comprehend its true historical value must learn many things from the sociologist, sociology in turn owes a heavy debt of gratitude to scholars who, thoroughly equipped with knowledge won by investigators in other fields, have enriched our detailed knowledge of the evolution of the Hebrew social system. First among these in grateful recollection must be named Prof. Robertson Smith, whose "Religion of the Semites" and "Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia," as original studies of social usages and institutions, are excelled in value by the works of one investigator only; namely, Lewis H. Morgan, whose "League of the Iroquois" and "Systems of Consanguinity" first opened the eyes of historical students in every part of the world to the actual facts, as distinguished from all fanci-

ful theories of the origins of human society. With Prof. Robertson Smith should be named one of our American scholars, Prof. George Moore of Andover. Of the textual excellences of Prof. Moore's version of the "Book of Judges" I may not speak; but, assuming that a man of his very unusual philological accomplishments has made no serious blunder on this side of his work, I may testify that his minute and thorough knowledge of all the essential processes of social evolution, his understanding of the exact significance of the various forms of family, clan, tribe, and confederation, of the early forms of property, contract, and testament, and of the beginnings of criminal law, is beyond all praise. The "Book of Judges" as thus edited by Mr. Moore must, I think, take its place with such texts as the Iliad and the Odyssey, the Works and Days of Hesiod, the Fasti of Ovid, the Twelve Tables of the Roman Law, the Germania of Tacitus, the Sanchus Mohr, the Welsh and the Saxon codes, as original sources of our knowledge of primitive institutions.

Since a scientific study of the nature of society and of the evolution of social forms is a necessary part of historical investigation, including the history of religion, it is also an indispensable preparation for a philosophical study of politics, especially of politics in the larger sense of the word, including the great problems of the relation of the dominant to the perishing races, of the powerful to the weaker nations, of the democratic to the arbitrary governments. All of these problems have their religious significance. They appeal to conscience not less than to intellect. What is the truth in regard to the assumed inevitablenesss of those developments of national policy upon which the United States, with other great world powers, have entered within the last few years? Where lies the part of righteousness, in which as a people, no less than as individuals, we should undertake to walk? In this hour of national mourning, when every voice of calumny is hushed, and for a time all rancor of partisan strife is forgotten, we may well lay aside our differing prepossessions, and ask whether science, which neither takes counsel of passion nor shrinks from any consequence of her revelations, has any word of helpful guidance for us in this grave crisis of human destiny.

In venturing to make answer to this question, I will speak only of those principles which all qualified students accept, and will try, as far as possible to exclude those elements that are matters of mere personal opinion. That

the exact meaning of this answer may be understood, a preliminary word about the nature of scientific truth is necessary. It is strange, but nevertheless true, that after half a century of glorification of science, and endless efforts to popularize scientific knowledge, the average, well-educated man at the beginning of the twentieth century has no comprehension whatsoever of what the scientific man means by "science." The average, well-educated man imagines that science is a form of absolute truth; whereas absolute truth is precisely the one thing which the scientific man knows nothing of, and is quite content to leave to his good friends, the theologians. Science is simply a detailed development of the familiar mathematical theory of probabilities. A fact, in the scientific sense of the word, is the very close agreement of many observations or measurements of the same phenomenon made by the same or by different observers. And by very close agreement the scientific man means one exceeding that which is given by the algebraic equation of chance. By a prediction the scientific man means a probability that an event will occur, much greater than a probability yielded by the algebraic equation of chance. All science, then, is simply a very much greater degree of probability that things are thus and so, or that they have been thus and so, or that they will be thus and so, than the probability of occurrence by chance. And the true achievements of science are measured not so much by the extent and variety of her observations as by the degree of the probability achieved in her generalizations and predictions. Curiously enough, the only popular writer who ever expressed the true spirit of science in a single neatly turned phrase was David Hume, when in his famous discussion of miracles he asked whether it was more probable that a miracle should happen or that men should be mistaken in their observations or should even tell a lie.

Remembering, then, that all scientific or cosmic laws, so called, are simply generalizations of probability, let us see what meaning there may be in the fact that innumerable observations agree in revealing integration (*i.e*, the consolidation of like units, or like groups, into ever-enlarging aggregates) as the fundamental process in all evolution. Whether it be in the vast realms of sidereal space or in the infinitely little cells of embryonic organisms, in the gray matter of the individual brain, or in the population and the territory of a nation, evolution is a literal material growth, an aggregation and concentration of matter. And,

when growth in this materialistic sense of the word ceases, dissolution has begun, and death awaits at the end. No true exception to this rule has ever been recorded. And, while science cannot say that none ever will be recorded, she is obliged, with the data now at command, to report that the probabilities that evolution, development, life, apart from integration, will ever be discovered, are infinitely small. While, therefore, the scientific man may not say that the political life of mankind cannot develop indefinitely without a continuing consolidation of small states into greater states, and of great states into world powers and empires, he is obliged to say that any such exceptional evolution is highly improbable, and that, when territorial consolidation finally ceases, it will be scientifically probable that man and civilization will then have reached the zenith of their power and glory, and will have entered upon the period of their dissolution.

But evolution has another aspect, also. With integration, and indeed a consequence of it, proceed assimilation and differentiation. Integrating atoms or molecules pound and drive one another hither and thither until their motions become rhythmical and synchronous, until order and harmony reign instead of chaos. Integrating populations in like manner pound and drive one another until their interests are conciliated, their cultures assimilated, their ideals harmonized. With the emergence thus of order from chaos, differing aptitudes and differing interests find their place and expression no longer in warfare, but in specialization and co-ordination. Variety harmonized means not strife, but the division of labor, the cooperation of infinitely diversified gifts in producng a result of common benefit.

Here, then, it would seem is the true opportunity for moral endeavor and religious enthusiasm. To oppose the cosmic law of integration may not be a misdirection of effort. The miraculous may happen, and anti-imperialism may demonstrate that the United States is to be the first commonwealth of a new heavens and a new earth in which a wholly new law of evolution shall reign. The scientific man can only defer in all respect to those who cherish such anticipations, and say, "Perhaps, good friends, but the probability is that you are to be bitterly disappointed." But effort expended in assimilating, conciliating, and harmonizing the elements that integration brings together is never misdirected. Integration itself aids and abets all such endeavors, since, by putting an

end to inter-tribal and petty international wars, it widens the area of peace. It is cosmic integration itself that beats the sword into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning-hook. It is then for the man of faith and love to stir the soil and sow the seed, to watch and to reap.

In the process of assimilation and differentiation the struggle for existence, which rages between group and group while consolidation is taking place, continues between class and class and between individual and individual. The conciliation of interests, the harmonizing of ideals, is not perfectly accomplished. Social life, like the conditions of vegetable or animal existence, reacts in differing measures and with unequal results upon different individuals. In the population there presently appear gradations of vitality, of intellectual force and comprehension, of morality, and of social nature, or altruism. Some men are then recognized as physically normal, others as physically abnormal, or defective. Some are found to be mentally sound, others mentally unsound in varying degrees,—the neurotic, the insane, the idiotic. And some, finally, are seen to be social in disposition and habits; while others are unsocial in various degrees, from mendicancy to instinctive criminality or deep degradation.

In these reactions of social evolution upon body, mind, and character, we discover another set of problems, interesting alike to the scientific student and to the religious man,—problems which must be solved theoretically by the rigorous methods of the one and practically by the love, the faith, and the self-sacrificing devotion of the other.

The remark was recently made by an eminent divine that, if the nineteenth century had demonstrated the survival of the fit as a truth of science, the twentieth century must achieve the salvation of the unfit as a fact of the moral life. This saying is either a great quibble or a great truth, according to the interpretation that is put upon it. Still, bearing in mind our definition of science as a calculation of probabilites, we may confidently say that in one sense of the word the salvation of the unfit is no more probable than a change in the relative dimensions of Jupiter and the earth. In one way or another the unfit will continue to perish, while the fit continue to survive. But, in another sense of the word,—a sense which appeals to humane feeling rather than to scientific conception,—the salvation of the unfit is possible and obligatory. Science, prompted by sympathy, has invented and has applied anæsthesia for physical pain. Science, philanthropy, re-

ligion, must find anæsthesia for moral pain. Men still must die; and the weak, as a rule, must die earlier than the strong. But death by consumption, by typhoid, by yellow fever, by diphtheria and the plague, may be and must be prevented. The mentally and the morally weak must, in general, continue to fight a losing battle with the mentally and morally strong; but defeat because of an inherited taint of insanity, of epilepsy or melancholia, may be and must be prevented. Above all must defeat in the battle of life, because of instinctive or professional criminality, be made among the things of the past.

In these very general conclusions, scientific men and religious men are, I think, substantially agreed; and it is an interesting fact that in this agreement they both stand in opposition to the scientific and the religious men of former generations. The science of earlier days knew nothing of preventive measures: it gave its attention wholly to palliatives and remedies. The religion of earlier days not only knew nothing, but also it cared nothing about the diminution of physical or even of moral evil. It thought only of converting the individual sinner, of selecting particular moral brands from the burning. The contrast between the social settlement of to-day and the city mission of other days is a perfect expression of the difference between two radically opposed ways of looking at the problem of evil.

The precise question suggested by this development, which the Church is now asking the scientific student of society to answer, is this: Is the new conception of the salvation of the unfit really sounder than the old one, and may we therefore expect in the long run better results from the new methods than from the old? Or, stating it a little more concretely, the question may be put thus: How far is it possible to save the unfit: first, as physical organisms with capacities for more or less health, more or less physical enjoyment of life; second, as industrial members of society, with more or less earning power; third, as moral members of society, with more or less ability to live within the established scheme of law and order? And, if these possibilities are practically zero, should all efforts to these ends be abandoned, and a return be made to the old plan of attempting only to save the soul; that is, to convert the will and change the heart of men for whom nothing else can be done?

An explicit answer to this question, which the pastor and the philanthropist so strongly desire, the scientific

student cannot yet give. He is still trying to determine this answer, and he must probably work at the problem for a long time to come before he can be reasonably sure of his results. He is closely watching all experiments, and endeavoring to record and analyze results. What he asks of the practical workers is that, so far as possible, they shall aid him by putting information at his disposal, and by themselves conducting their experiments with as much regard as possible to continuity and precision.

So far as data already available point to any positive conclusion, it is this, namely: First, that the new moral and philanthropic method of trying to save the unfit from physical and moral pain while they are undergoing extinction admits of unlimited extension. Painless methods of extirpation may be substituted for the painful ones. Second, that the new methods of trying to save the unfit for some usefulness, to themselves and to society in its industrial and moral organization, are probably applicable to a much smaller proportion of the unfit than in recent years has been supposed. Attempts to make tenement-house dwellers thrifty and cleanly in their habits, to make paupers industrious, and to reform criminals, have been, I think, on the whole disappointing. Third, therefore, the older notion that the salvation of the unfit is a term without finite meaning, without reality in a practical workaday world, and that it has meaning only in a religious sense as designating some process of conversion which finds no expression in good conduct, but which may, it is hoped, have a value for a future state of existence, applies to a very much larger proportion of the unfit than in recent years has been imagined.

To determine whether these conclusions really are true is obviously a matter of great practical importance. If the utmost that we can hope to accomplish for a majority of the unfit is a substitution of painless for painful extinction, we are at present wasting not only a great deal of the material resource of society, but, what is immeasurably worse, a great deal of the energy of dutiful men and women whose lives are of inestimable value as compared with those whom, in impossible ways, they are trying to save. The chances, I fear, are at least even that we should make moral headway in society more rapidly if, instead of trying, as now, to reform a majority of our paupers and criminals, we adopted the alternative course of shutting them up where they could no longer harm their fellowmen, and where, kindly treated and kept sufficiently em-

ployed, their departure from a world into which they never should have been born should be so far as possible deprived of its cruelty.

If, then, perhaps, it is true that there are many individuals for whom we can entertain no higher hope, so far as this life is concerned, than that their failures and their taking-off shall be made as little painful to themselves and to others as may be, the sympathetic heart cannot fail to raise again the question, as old as human dread and human faith, whether there be substantial ground for the belief that in some other life than this all the wrongs and all the suffering of our present world shall be made right. Does the scientific study of man in his social relations shed any light not yielded by the study of man in his individual nature upon the problem of ultimate human destiny?

In answer we can only say that no such new light is forthcoming unless the problem of destiny is somehow involved in the problem of history. Sociology has, we believe, given us some new knowledge of the origins of man's higher faculties.

When controversy first began to wage hotly over Mr. Darwin's "The Origin of Species" and "The Descent of Man," many religious minds were convinced by the facts and reasonings of those immortal books. Among them, however, were some that could not surrender a belief that mentally and spiritually, if not physiologically, man must be different in kind, as well as in degree, from the lower animals. These found refuge in one of those pseudo-scientific conceptions which so often have been made to do duty in the work of reconciling science with theology. This was the idea: that, at some stage in the evolution of the human body from the lower animal forms, a rational mind, an immortal soul, was miraculously created or put into the earthly tabernacle. I think I do not mistake if I say that for fifteen or twenty years the liberal wing of the Christian Church, whether calling itself heterodox or orthodox, asserted that it was prepared to accept the theories of evolution, so far as the material universe and the human body were in question, but not as accounting for man's higher faculties.

Now, if this position could have been maintained, a belief in a soul separate from the body and surviving the body would undoubtedly have been strengthened by the inability of science to account for man's most characteristic qualities. That is to say, if science could have offered no probable hypothesis as to the origin of the higher

human faculties, the theological notion of a miraculous origin would have stood unshaken. And, if miraculous origin be affirmed, that there is no reason whatsoever for doubting survival after bodily death.

To those minds that cannot rest content in faith, minds that crave a scientific assurance of immortality, the scientific study of society is, I fear, distasteful and disappointing. For it is precisely in sociological study that evolutionist science now finds materials for its hypothesis of a natural, and evolutionary origin of reason and conscience. It is a sociological conception of personality that science now would substitute for the theological, thereby completing the edifice of evolutionary theory. In social relations, in the contact of individual with individual, in the slow development of comradeship and co-operation, we believe we find the causes of the gradual conversion of instinct into reason, of a merely organic sympathy into that intelligent, reflective sympathy which is the chief element in the highly complex mental state that we call conscience.

A merely animal struggle for existence results in a survival of the fit; that is to say, of those who are best adapted to the physical conditions of existence. But the fit are not necessarily the best. Codfish are the fit in the waters of Georgian Bay, and angle-worms in garden mould. In these environments, codfish and angle-worms survive where higher organisms would die. It is companionship and mutual aid, a social medium, that convert a survival of the fit into a survival of the best.

This, then, is the only contribution that a scientific study of society can make to religious faith. It can say that the question of human destiny belongs wholly and absolutely to faith, and not to science. It can say of man's finite faculties and of his existence in this world that there remains no sphere in which it is any longer necessary to supplement natural explanations by the assumption of miracle or special creation. The higher finite faculties of man, no less than his bodily form, science now regards as a product of the natural process. On the other hand, not more in the study of society than in any other field has science discovered the ultimate nature of either physical or moral phenomena. Science can tell us how things have assumed the forms which we now observe, and she can make predictions of probability about future finite occurrences. But she can utter no word as to a first cause, as to whether or not mortal man is also immortal,

or as to anything whatever that lies behind or lies beyond the world of sense. The infinite possibilities of that unknown realm will still be left to faith when science has completed the circle of her investigation in the complex phenomena of human society, as surely as they were so left when she was beginning her observations among the simpler phenomena of physical things.

THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

I believe in the Holy Catholic Church. This profession stands in solemn conjunction with the profession of faith in God and Christ and spiritual blessing and immortal life. In the Middle Ages the *credo* meant the bending of the knee before a church too brilliantly manifest to rest only on the spiritual evidence of things not seen. That spiritual faith had consecrated a clerical jurisdiction that claimed a complete sovereignty over mundane life.

As vicar of God, head of the church, and sovereign of the world, the great Innocent III. could assemble in his Lateran Council, 1215, the deputies of kings and emperors, as well as a multitude of bishops, abbots, and priors. He prohibited marriage within certain degrees of kinship, regulated the observance of sacraments and the election of bishops, and decided vexed problems of thological discussion. This did not measure his authority. He listened to the complaints of English barons against their king only to confirm the ban upon them. He refused the German crown to a claimant, excommunicated the king of France, assigned the lands of Raymond of Toulouse to Simon de Montfort, decreed that Jews and Saracens wear different clothes from Christians. The splendor of that council marked an almost perfect attainment of the visible unity of the Western Church with its interfusion of moral and political authority.

At a cost to Europe of untold misery, Protestantism rent that unity; and Protestantism could not maintain itself in the form of a rival visible unity. To-day we have in our own land the extreme of visible disunion, an indefinite number of religious companies living under laws that are applicable to many heretogeneous associations. The social unity is the political unity of the nation. The diverse voluntary associations called churches appeal to diversities of taste in the social whole. They are variously named, and variously organized and governed. They have unlike and changing forms of worship or of practical activities. Once a single system of administra-

tion and authority was enforced and accepted as a matter of divine right and divine necessitation. Now we have many systems that began indeed with more or less dogma about divine prescription, but which to-day rest mainly upon their adaptation to human nature.

The topic assigned me happily excuses us from discussing the development of this tangle of outward forms of church life. Were we tracing this differentiation of the old unity into a multitude of legal forms, the conclusion would probably be that in the sound judgment of most people to-day the legal form does not matter much, the form of organization being conditioned by many complex human factors that are themselves variable quantities. Some of us might even adhere to the thesis of the brilliant jurist Sohen, and declare that any system of legal church authority is essentially a contradiction of the nature of the church itself, a human instrument forever incommensurable with the spiritual substance, the substitution of human will for the spirit that bloweth where it listeth.

You and I may have deep affection for those forms of visibility which our Presbyterian or Congregationalist or Episcopalian fathers found enjoined in the New Testament; but we no longer find, as did the fathers, a divine command for these forms. Bishops, elders, synods, parish committees or national conferences are for us simply justified utilities. The churches made visible by them are not the church which is an object of religious faith. No conference or congress of such churches can aggregate the title of the church in the sense of the topic assigned me here. We are concerned with the Holy Catholic Church which is not a product of sagacious preference or fashion, but an abiding object of religious faith; that church to which a Platonic spirit of the second century ascribed a pre-existence prior to any earthly manifestation of it just as whole heartedly as a heavenly pre-existence was claimed for the Christ of history; that church which is not made by man or formed by human assemblage, but is constituted purely by divine operation. Even the most extreme Congregationalism recognized it. The Cambridge Platform, denying "an universal visible church," believed still in "The Catholic Church," defining it as "the whole company of those that are elected, redeemed, and in time effectually called from the state of sin and death into a state of grace and salvation in Jesus Christ." For such a company both of the quick and the

dead the Cambridge Synod could not legislate. It provided form and law only for particular visible churches.

Our fathers were more facile in theological distinctions than are we, but we cannot apprehend or value what is offered to our thought without imitating their distinctions and thus escaping ambiguity. There are at least three valid and important distinctions to be made. By "the church" we may mean, in respect to its essence, the spiritual operation of God upon human life in relations which we call religious, and which our Cambridge Platform made technical under terms of election, redemption and effectual calling. This was the meaning of Irenæus: "In ecclesia posuit deus universam operationem spiritus, ubi enim ecclesia ibi et spiritus dei,"—"In the church God established the full operation of the spirit; for, where the church is, there also is the spirit of God." This was the meaning of Ignatius, who, like Paul, identified the spirit and Christ: "Wherever Jesus Christ, there is the Catholic Church." We may mean, in the second place, the number of souls visited by that divine operation, whether glorified in heaven or militant on earth. We may mean, further, the companies, local or natural or ecumenical, who with various forms of organization and worship seek to manifest the supersensible system of divine beneficence and to treasure the hallowing influence of all who were saints in this participation in spiritual blessing. These companies are Catholic, Greek or Roman, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Anglican, Methodist, or however else named. Too often it is thought that an historical consideration can deal only with these historic institutions; but the invisible Catholic Church, which is the operation of the Holy Spirit upon human souls, is also within the sphere of history in, with and under, or even apart from the historic instruments and agencies which it has evolved. Even the man who has a veil upon his heart and can recognize only a system of human ideals and illusions, sees that that system binds the religious history of the western world into an historic unity and an organic process.

Modern Biblical study has classified more and more this object of religious faith, the church in its earliest manifestation,—the church of God. That is Paul's name; and who can find a better? The name was no new coinage of Paul's. It was the name of Israel as a religious community. It was the name of the Old Testament church, the *Qahal Jahve,* Israel worshipping and Israel receiving

blessings from God. It is a name transferred by Paul to the Christians, the new Israel, the new people of God. The idea of the church goes back, then, into the depths of Israel's historic life. It had a pre-Christian history. It stood for that community formed by divine favor, receiver of divine benefactions, heir to promised power and riches and dominion. That community wore more conspicuously the aspect of a church when, after the exile, it studied the law in the synagogues and offered sacrifice in the temple, and prayed and sighed for the reward of its zeal and services; but the homogeneity of religion and state life had not yet ceased. In Judaism, with its theocratic conception, the object of worship had a political value; and the blessings sought and expected were too often purely mundane, political, material. The first followers of Jesus were still members of the Israel which was at once a political and a religious organism; but it was inevitable that they should become differentiated as a new fellowship, a new people of God without political limits, a new Israel without the wall of the law.

This inevitability was due to Jesus. For that which constitutes any religious fraternity is the blessedness which it enjoys, the religious experience which it obtains, the salvation which God conveys to it. Under the familiar title of the "kingdom of God," Jesus announced present and impending blessings which were not material, political or mundane. They were benefactions that came as comfort for weariness and distress of soul, for sin and suffering and mourning. They were for the pure-hearted and the men of simple, uncalculating goodness,—goodness that was godlike with God's sheer amplitude of unconditioned love. They were blessings kindred with his own mysterious privilege as God's anointed; they were sonship to the perfect Father. They were blessings that could wear another richly laden name, the name of life eternal. Let us concede, as perhaps we should not, that Jesus clearly transcended the notion of Israel as the congregation receiving such blessing. The church which is so named in Matthew's Gospel means still the assemblage of persons made an assemblage by the saving blessings thus described as theirs. In any case the earliest followers continued at first within the organism of Israel until the Jews, spurning the universality of such blessings, cast them out. And these first followers had an ever richer and more intense experience of divine

blessings, which set them more and more apart from the political Israel. The Jew looked to the future: the follower of Jesus exulted also in present gladness of soul. The Jew obeyed ancient prescription: the Christian lived by present inspiration. The imagination of the Jew was dominated by pictures of the wrath which Israel's sovereign would pour upon the Roman; the Christian felt that his soul had been brought into the sunshine of a vitalizing personal experience to blossom anew toward God. He was thrilled with a sense of restored or new created sonship to a spiritual Father, of assured peace with God, of an inward energy that illuminated insight, pervaded the depths of the heart with holy emotions, animated him with a certain hope of a perfect and beatific destiny in an order of things that should speedily be revealed from heaven, a hope and a spirit that energized the will with moral ardor and moral affections and moral power.

The whole substance and content of this gift of present and expected salvation was supersensible, unpolitical, spiritual. It was not of this world. It was the outpoured Holy Spirit. It was the life of Jesus over again in each believer. Inevitably thus the church of God, as this new reign of the Holy Spirit, became a fellowship differentiated from any political organism. It was the universal, the catholic church of the one world-wide God. Its unity was felt in the one universal faith, hope and joy of the spirit, which were divine operations, ever freshly conveyed when the word was preached or the sacramental communings practised. In the original and intense creative moment of early Christianity the church was in essence the work of God on the soul, or, in another sense, the company of souls so wrought upon. The whole spirit dwelt within each temple, however varied its special gifts to this man or that. The whole church in one sense was found in each congregation, whether in Ephesus or Corinth or Rome. Nay, Tertullian could even say, "In uno et altero ecclesia est, ecclesia vero Christus,"—"In this man or that is the church, for the church is Christ" (De Pœnit. 10).

This is the first picture of the Christian church, the church as the gift of the spirit of God to men; the play of heaven upon the earth, or, in a secondary sense, the company of those who live the heavenly life on earth, who sojourn in the flesh, but are citizens of heaven.

Then began the development of another form of the thought by which the operation of this spiritual energy became a mechanism under human control. Early Christianity was dualistic. Its blessings and its authority were superhuman, supermundane. No concerted human organization existed at first. All were priests and direct recipients of the operations of the spirit. It did not so remain. Harnack has brilliantly expounded the earlier history of Christianity as a secularizing of these supermundane possessions, an accommodation of them to the forms of the world, to its inheritance of philosophy and social custom and ritualistic taste and political organization. Nowhere does this appear more strikingly than in the conception of the church. The age of the free spirit passed, a mixture of Platonic speculation and Oriental myth invaded the churches; and, in reaction against this, the tradition that conserved the first missionary preaching began to organize and control the Christian companies with fixed norms and official prerogatives. The details of this interesting process fill the volumes of historians. It is enough to note that the spiritual system of early Christianity began to develop a body, and that this external framework of organization found its analogy in the Roman Empire. The church as a visible measurable historic institution arose, one unified body with legal juristic principles and methods. The institution became imperial, political. It was a part of the world's order. Then the distinction of substance and form faded out. The action of the spirit was through the machinery of this outer body. The church of God in the old transcendent sense was identified with the visible intramundane form: the kingdom of God was the hierarchic institution. The sacramental means and its hierarchic ministrants came to be the very essence of the church. Salvation was conditioned by obedience to the Roman pontiff, an obedience that in theory, at least, was exacted in every sphere of man's life.

Protestantism—a revival of earlier and simpler faith—was a revival of the earlier conception of the church. It argued that the Roman form was an historic growth, a thing of historical accidents or man's assumption. Protestantism repudiated the Roman form as it claimed to be of the essence, and found again the essence of the church in the grace mediated by the word and the sacraments. True, Protestantism began again to evolve the bodily

expression. It produced organization and framework under the pressure of political or logical necessities. Protestantism, however, has never lost the distinction learned between the inner substance which is divine and the phenomenal changing historic form. Its exclusive churches tend to become friendly and co-operating denominations. We with others have our place in this divine unity of spiritual operation on man which is over and above all denominations. We are of the church of God, pleading only with our brethren that our form of thought is purer, our form of organization safer, our worship and aims such as give freer, less obstructed course to the Great Will who creates and sustains the catholic church. We plead with them, too, to recognize that the spirit of God is not restricted by limits of Christian terminology, and that, with whatever differences of spiritual privilege,—

"One holy church of God appears
Through every age and race."

Having seen that this divine dispensation is the original, essential and permanent idea of the church in the light of its history, let us consider the relation of the outer and visible institution to that inner dispensation of the spirit. The process of life, the dispensation of the spirit, in historical systems of ethical or political conduct, of scientific and technical activity, do not drop out of the skies as interjections into an earthly order. In religion, it is true, we are not done talking of revelations. We mean that in religious experience there may be a conscious recognition of the will that moves us. Even here the recognition comes to an historical process. Possibly your Oriental can pluck revelations out of the blue as the juggler reaches up and fetches an egg or an orange from nowhere, but the Occidental toils as Martin Luther toiled in the monastery of Erfurt with that slow wrestling labor of comprehension and analysis which we call research. Only after this intense brooding toil of critical active appropriation of the past teaching does the essence of it leap into his soul as a present power and illumination, a vision of God's operation, a revelation. In the case of Jesus the process is unrecorded. We meet him when for him the analysis and search are over and the vision found, the truth extricated and distinguished from its accidents. It was, however, a truth extricated from a Jewish inheritance. Communion with the universal Father came by

the word that was spoken first by prophets. So is it always; faith comes by hearing. The soul's contact with God is occasioned by the word received. Revelation,—let us name it so with hearty sincerity,—but it comes in an historic process.

Let us use the parable of another experience. Let us consider that other phase of the process of life which we name nationality. Let us think of England, since we can view it as a concrete object in practicable perspective, and comprehend it by the sympathy of our lineage. The individual becomes an Englishman through the action of England. For the most part, in placid times of peace the nationality becomes his by a sort of natural process. The totality of English life works on him, whether he knows it or not. The principles and usages of his family and town mould him and shape him into a certain type of man. The established order of the land accustoms him to certain precedures, ways of doing things, methods of achieving results, to certain notions of rights and duties. That established order, with its prescriptions of ways and means, has its concrete visible expression in the institutions of the state, its laws and law-making bodies, its courts and administrators. These are the agents that shape every child into an English man, an English woman.

But this is not the only way. This is the average, humdrum way. That way alone makes the uncritical Englishman, the insular creature, the man of mere use and wont. Others, by virtue of their intellectual training and extrainsular experience, reflect and ponder and compare. They have a finer and clearer, though not less ardent, possession of the historic inheritance. To all these, however, may come some rare and more intense experience, in which the individual no longer depends on this diffusion of the English idea through the totality of its subjects, but feels the idea operate directly upon him as an active spiritual force. These are the great national moments, the crises of danger and enthusiasm. Then the essence and substance of all that England means shines clear and luminous, and is a kind of electric energy thrilling the man to be an Englishman in an intense personal sense. He sees. He beholds the content of his nationality in exalted vision, and surrenders to it. It enters into his being as a sacramental gift. In that ecstatic moment he has transcended the action of the sum of persons who make the present England. He has com-

muned directly with the spiritual forces of England. We observe, nevertheless, that even for this supreme personal intuition, this direct revelation, the established outer order, the state was a condition. That was the vehicle through which England's spiritual forces had been assimilating him. Nor does he now dispense with the outer body. Should this vision make him a stern critic of the actual state, it is only because he sees that change or simplification or freer movement can enable the state to deliver the content of spiritual force more easily and more completely or more purely. The state remains for him as a necessary mediating institution. This is our parable.

Even if in analysis and thought alone, we can separate religion from the full life process, just as we can separate the elements that we name political. In religion, then, as a part of the life process of humanity, let us see the same law. Just as the nationality was not the state form, but a spiritual system using the state as a vehicle and agent, so religion is a spiritual system sharply distinguishable from its historic institution,—the church,—yet using the church as an instrument in order to enter the individual life. In religion, too, there are rhythms,—times when the currents flow into us almost insensibly, times when the current becomes an electrifying shock. There are generations of use and wont, and moments when men are seers and prophets.

In both cases the outer agent is a vital necessity. In quiet times the spiritual system of ideals and forces, religion as an objective thing in this spiritual world, shapes and disciplines us by the usages of prayer and pronouncement which our church has received. Some would limit that reception to a lifting bodily out of a remote past. He who knows that life is from God will have a church that receives a religion refined and empowered by its vital relations with the whole developing process of life, ethical, political, social, scientific, æsthetic. While the church is open to the currents of the world's full life, when it responds to every advance of man, then the church easily acts for that complex of spiritual reality which is religion in the objective sense, the spirit of God. Were the institution, the body, ever plastic and alive, there would be no crises, no unsatisfied withdrawals and schisms. The church which cherishes the hope of a petrified immobility and makes *quoad semper* its motto is forever forcing such crises.

Normally, at least, the outer institution is the agent that conveys the truth to the individual life. But in religion, too, there are distinctive creative moments. Then the outer instrument seems to drop from sight as the truth enters into some exalted soul, and becomes there the throb and thrill of a personal possession. God is no longer an idea, but a present reality in our vivid recognition, however indefinable and unconscious the act of our intuition may be. We saw him in no form of outer perception, but we know that God empowered us. Such supreme moments begin new histories for you and me, or in grander illustrations, like Jesus and Luther and Channing and Brooks, new epochs of social history. For the time being, Jesus or Paul or any privileged one may be so completely the organ of the spirit that with the boldness of Tertullian, we may call them the church. The treasured memory and word of such lives may forever stand as means within the church for enabling us to experience the spirit of God with them. But no individual remains the sole organ of the spirit of God. The Father works not only hitherto, but now. Jesus predicted richer experiences than his own. You and I may often enough, by the aid of the church visible, rise into the ample liberty of the church unseen; but we do not therefore abandon or destroy the meditating instrument. We only seek to make it the more perfect vehicle of the spirit. We ask it to lay aside the encumbrances to purer truth, to become freer and more plastic and responsive to the present operation of God. We seek to make the form fitter to the substance, all its words coincident with truth, all its rights the proper sacraments of the grace invisible, all its endeavors for the social whole such as will make the world God's perfect kingdom. As we revere the giver, let us reverence the means. As we would have our work be his work, let us with loyalty and awe create with him the perfect instrument of his spirit's operation.

THE CHURCH'S INTEREST IN GOOD GOVERNMENT.

BY FRANK MOSS.

What is, what should be, what must be the attitude of the church toward the bad government that prevails in many of our cities, and that is spreading to all the cities of our nation? The church must be interested in the subject, because the civil government, particularly local civil government, shapes the habit of thought and action of the people. Bad government, that we are discussing, is not negligent government: we can forgive that. That can be amended. It is not accidental government: it is the deliberate, wilful perversion of the right spirit of government, of the true American spirit of government, thereby certainly affecting the thought and action of the people. And for what purpose? It is for the purpose of making power and coining money out of the evil propensity of the people, thereby corrupting them and making what should be a religious nation a corrupt nation.

These conditions affect the conditions of the people. Of course, they do. They make the conditions of life hard. They bear most heavily upon those citizens that are least able to protect themselves. They make it difficult for men to earn an honest living. They make it difficult for a boy and a girl to get along as well as his or her fellows unless they descend to that which is ignoble. They make it difficult for the business man to conduct his business in an honest way. Thus the active, positive, immediate conditions are affected; the people are touched; more than that, the ideals of the people are touched by it, their modes of thought, their habits of conscience. In a great city every one wants to get rich, wants to be successful. Young men look for the evidence of success, and they want to find out what avenues must be travelled for success; and conscience gets duller and duller and more and more quiescent as the business men of life, with their own burdens on their shoulders, see how men may prosper

and how men may heap up riches if they would but do certain things. It is hard for young men, young men who have talents for public life and are ambitious, to use them. It is hard for them to stand on the true road, be always able to look at their faces in the looking-glass in the morning, and yet go through life with thin pocket-books and ever-increasing burdens to be carried, when they see those about them with less ability, but making ignoble use of those abilities, rising constantly to positions of eminence and power. The church sees these things, but the church has not found a way to enter into them at all. Here and there some minister finds that he can say a word, and does it with fear and trembling and with many a labored conversation with official brethren afterward.

I am a member of a militant denomination myself; but, when I come to go into this conflict to-day, I feel that, while I take my personal religion with me, my church is not with me, except in a sympathetic sense. It stands outside. If there is any need for inter-denominational activity, for getting together upon some plane of common worship, it is this field. If that is not a proper field for the people of God, regardless of denominational lines to enter upon, I do not know of any. I say that the church which is wondering how it can get on without seeming to interfere with politics, without seeming to interfere with a matter which does not belong to it, when it sees its own child dragged down into the dens of infamy, should away with all impedimenta, and get out and fight for its own. [Applause.]

We read the story of the good Samaritan. Well, the man to-day with the spirit of God in him should go out and find the man who has fallen among thieves, and there may be many of them. He should bind up their wounds and pay their bills sometimes; but, more than that, he should catch the thieves and put these thieves where they cannot do such things. And if their government,—that is, the officials who represent it,—are parties of these thieves, he must catch those thieves and cast them into utter darkness, where they cannot do such things again.

Mr. Moss then proceeded to give a series of illustrations of conditions in the city of New York.

Around the corner from the church is the saloon, and it has its back room; and I have seen little boys and girls climbing up on the window-sills, and looking curiously into those back rooms at the painted creatures and those

who were surrounding them. I have never heard of the church attacking one of these places on the ground that it was interfering with its moral and religious work. There have been a few such cases, but they are long passed. The churches know that it does no good ordinarily to attack the individual places. They know the power of that place is above the policeman, above the court, that it reaches to the power that makes out of our free government a mockery and a delusion. Upstairs in the same saloon is the gambling-room where young men learn to gamble, where young men enter a course of fast living which has reached out and claimed thousands and thousands of the best and brightest of our youth. The church struggles along to find a few hundred converts. We should think something almighty had struck the city if they made a few thousand converts. But the eight thousand saloons—a large proportion of which are simply dives,—and the thousand gambling houses, and the thousand policy shops, and the thousand disorderly houses,—how many thousands do they make? Who can tell? Snatched right out of our churches, many of them. Snatched right out of our Sunday-schools.

A poor Irishman, living down by Battery Place, came up to the police commissioner, and complained that his family of children could not look out of the back windows without seeing things that nobody ought to see—much less children—through the back windows of a saloon.

One night, going through the East Side streets, I saw a crowd. A boy on a soap-box was surrounded by twenty or thirty other boys; and he was saying: "Do you think the city government is treating us right? We are going to school and learning our lessons to get ready to be men. They furnish our school-houses; and the government puts teachers in them, and furnishes us books, and teaches us lots of things. But, when we are going to school, we have to pass bad houses, and women on the door-steps talk to us and call us in. When we are going to school to learn our lessons, we are taught these things that even men ought not to know. I do not think the government is doing right by us. If we fellows were big enough to vote, we would show them that is not right."

I talked to a woman who had kept one such house. "How did you come to do this?" I said. "I do not know." "Did you do this sort of thing in the old country?" "Oh no; I never would have done such a thing as that at home.

I came here with my little children, for I thought this was a great country with opportunities. I settled down on this great busy street. I found it hard to do honest work; but I did discover that lots of my neighbors were keeping this kind of places; and I said to myself, 'It is wrong, and the police will come and stop these people.' But the police, when they came, did not stop them, but took money from them." Before she knew it she was in the business, and was allowed to stay in it until all her property was wiped out; and then they put her in jail. A woman came to me and said: "I am in great persecution. I come to you for advice and help. Once I kept a criminal place in New York. I had it a good many years. I paid the police an awful lot of money. Then I realized how much wrong these things were doing and I let my house go. I got menial employment. I began to work for my living, and have been working for three years. I cannot work in peace. The police find me out. The police come to me, and say, 'You must open a house.' I say, 'I don't want to.' They say: 'You must go and open a house. We won't charge you too much.' I refused. Then some one comes and tells my employer of my past life, and then I find I must get other employment."

A Jewish rabbi told me that one day he was walking through an East Side street and saw a man he had known in the old country, who said to him: "Yes, my store pays well. My expenses are so much, my rent so much a month, and $6 a month to the police." "What do you pay the police $6 a month for?" "You see those barrels of mackerel on the sidewalk? The ordinances of the city do not allow that; but, if that barrel of mackerel was inside the store, people would not see it, so I must give the police $6 a month." Some months after the rabbi found that this man was becoming still more prosperous; for the police were employing him to go around and collect $6 a month from others, and paying him a commission on what he collected. Said the rabbi: "I have translated the Declaration of Independence into Russian for my fellow-countrymen; but they say that is all on paper,—that is all it means. Suppose we didn't pay these police money, what would happen to us? The police would come and land his club alongside of our heads."

Mr. Moss then related other incidents showing the brutality of the police, and how honest citizens, who interfered to ask for more humanity in the treatment of drunk-

ards who were arrested, were "run in" for disorderly conduct.

The cry to the church is a trumpet-call. It is a trumpet-call from those who are privileged to speak to the church. It comes from the poor, the wrecked, the unfortunate,—those who are dying, those whose souls are being wrecked under these conditions. It is a cry to deliver them, not simply from the robbers, but from those who are partners with the robbers, and who are enriching themselves in the very life-blood that has been drained from the poor.

I lay this upon your heart. There is nothing so contagious as rot. The great city of New York dominates the commercial and financial life of this country. Other cities imitate its methods. There is hardly one who comes from a little city that cannot say that there is a ring or corrupt company in his little city. The appeal to the almighty dollar is often more powerful than an appeal to the still small voice. How many men would have the courage to stand up and say that which they know? This is an appeal for what you can do for humanity, for Jesus Christ, for God.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. Dr. Whiton.—I wish to say, by way of comment on what we have heard,—things that have stirred every human soul to rage,—that the remark of the speaker that this was a field for inter-denominational activity and co-operation was a very mild one, in view of what happened last week in New York. Last week a legal incorporation was effected of the church federation movement,—the Federation of Churches and Other Religious Organizations,—with this particular end in view, among many others; namely, to serve as a medium for the expression of the united sentiment of the churches and the exercise of the united influence of the churches for the physical, economical, moral, social, and political welfare of the community. That was distinctively among the objects proposed by this new incorporated federation movement. I wish to say that in the city of New York the church federation movement, inaugurated a year ago, has been laid out upon such broad and liberal lines that no religious organization of any kind whatever and no organization of any kind which contemplates the moral interests of the community is excluded from membership in the federation. It may

seem, therefore, that what has been stated is a most cogent argument for the promotion of the church federation movement in this state by those who have the interests at heart which are threatened by the evils that have been so terribly and truly depicted, and also for the initiation in other states of the church federation movement on similar lines to those on which it has been incorporated in this state,—the dawn, we hope, of better things. [Applause.]

Judge Morris.—The eloquent speaker made some reference to Baltimore as holding out an example of considerable progress in municipal reform. It may be said, I think, that there does not exist there any organized system of plunder. I think it may be said that the finances of the city are honestly administered. It was hoped, when the reforms were instituted, that the municipal government would be taken out of politics. The result of these efforts leads one to think that the day is far distant when municipal elections and the choice of municipal officers can be taken out of politics. Political organizations are institutions of long growth and great labor and careful preparation, and are not to be set aside. But this has happened; and I say it as confirming what has been said by the principal speaker,—that all such reforms are matters of individual courage and sensitiveness of conscience. There is no great panacea, no great plan that can bring that about. It depends upon the sensitiveness of the conscience and the civic courage of a comparatively few individuals. In Baltimore the conditions have been favorable. It is an old city of gradual growth. The people who live in the city are the people who own it. There has been no large influx of the foreign population of an undesirable kind, so that it is an homogeneous population; and it has been brought around by a great variety of circumstances that the two political parties are very evenly divided, so that a change of twelve hundred votes from one side to the other elects the ticket,—that is, in a voting population of between sixty thousand and eighty thousand people Now by persistent effort and at a great cost, considering the apparently simple result, there has been brought about a condition of public opinion, so that in the city there are two or three thousand people who will move from one ticket to the other, as the candidates have pledged themselves to good government. They will decide their vote by the question of good government, irrespective of political preferences in that particular

election. That sentiment was organized and developed by a small society of very devoted men called the Good Government League. When candidates are spoken of for nomination, it is their practice to publish in the newspapers a biographical account of these men; and, if there is anything in a man's record which makes it undesirable that he should be rewarded with public office, it is brought to the minds of those who are influenced in that way, and, by the consciences of between two and three thousand people in a city of half a million, good government has to a very considerable extent been put into operation there. [Applause.]

THE ORGANIZATION OF LABOR.

BY REV. EDWARD CUMMINGS.

In view of the present agitated state of the public mind in regard to the vexed problem of labor combinations, it may be well to turn for a moment to the lessons of the past.

A little more than a quarter of a century ago the English public mind was just recovering from a great panic in regard to the industrial, social, and political dangers of Trade Unionism. There was nothing new about this panic. It was only one of a long series of such periodic alarms in regard to alleged dangers supposed to be inherent in labor organizations. For the better part of a century—ever since the economic virus of Adam Smith and the apostles of selfishness and *laissez faire* had poisoned the social system, and infected the whole tissue of the body politic and the body economic—the English public mind (not to say the Anglo-Saxon public mind) had been greviously afflicted with chronic combination-phobia. And throughout the whole of the nineteenth century this chronic fear of combinations had culminated at more or less regular intervals in these periodic panics, or attacks of acute economic hysteria. At such crises in the disease the whole fabric of industrial and political liberty and prosperity seemed to the disordered British fancy to be undermined by the seditious and disastrous efforts of organized labor to interfere with the beneficent order of nature. Nay, even at such moments of periodic excitement the very existence of labor combinations and their supposed machinations for raising wages and improving the lamentable conditions under which men, women, and children were being sacrificed to unrestrained greed and to a barbarous economic creed seemed little short of impious and sacrilegious attempts to tamper with a divine order of *laissez faire*, of natural selection and rejection, of inevitable sacrifice of weak to strong,—a divine order which had been revealed in the canonical books of the sacred economic gospel according to Adam Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, and all the other apostles and expositors of the nineteenth-century creed of individual-

istic self-seeking, unregulated competition, legislative non-interference.

The chronic manifestations of this combination-phobia are familiar enough to the most cursory student of economic history. In the first place, at the beginning of the century all forms of trade combination were strictly prohibited. This drastic prohibitory legislation was followed at the beginning of the second quarter of the century by a ludicrously timid and vacillating legislative policy which half tolerated the existence of trade unions. But for three-quarters of a century they continued to be burdened with heavy legal disabilities and were treated as objects of constant suspicion, spasmodic persecution, and occasional parliamentary investigation. Then suddenly, by a dramatic irony of fate, just at the moment when the alleged abuses and intolerable dangers of labor combinations were supposed to call aloud for a reversion to drastic legislative repression, trade unionism emerged triumphantly from the trying ordeal of a prolonged and avowedly hostile parliamentary investigation. Thus it happened that at the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century an unfriendly and uncharitable public opinion was reluctantly convinced of the public utility of labor combinations, and that, too, by the very evidence which had been confidently relied upon for a verdict of wholesale condemnation and repression.

As a net result of this more accurate knowledge of the real aims and purposes of labor organizations, the average citizen realized for the first time that, in spite of legislative repression, legal disabilities, unjust suspicion, the most intelligent and industrious artisans of the country were making heroic efforts to help each other to meet the great exigencies of life,—sickness, accident, old age, disability, iregularity of employment, out of work, death, destitution of widows and orphans. For to such purposes of self-help and mutual aid, hostile investigation unexpectedly proved that 90 per cent of all the millions collected and disbursed by trade unions had thus far been directed, only a paltry 10 per cent going on the average to the dreaded offensive and defensive work of industrial warfare and trade disputes.

This was a totally unexpected discovery, not only for the English public mind, but also for intelligent students of our new industrial civilization all over the world. And, wherever in the civilized world these astonishing

facts were known, trade unionism henceforth stood pre-eminently for something more than industrial conspiracy and warfare. Legislators began to see that labor combinations were not primarily devoted to fomenting sedition and propagating economic heresies. Capitalists reluctantly admitted that the chief business of the trade unions they had tried so hard to penalize and crush had thus far been the prosaic business of mutual insurance and self-help, not the melodramatic and suicidal occupation of hatching industrial conspiracies and waging war on prosperity and trade. Even the academic mind began to concede that organized labor might find some legitimate supplementary functions in caring for the large amount of human wreckage which must inevitably be left in the wake of that beneficent competition which was embodied in the pitiless workings of the "iron law of wages" and the Malthusian doctrine of biological selection and rejection as a means of adjusting the supply of labor to the demand.

Thus, after a long and dreary fight for nearly a century, against great odds, organized labor dramatically succeeded in throwing off its legal disabilities and taking its place once for all among the institutions of recognized public utility. And there it still remains, a legitimate and increasingly important factor in the industrial equipment of Anglo-Saxon civilization. For, while this dramatic vindication of labor organizations cannot be said to have effected a complete cure of the hereditary combination-phobia in the English and the American public mind, to the credit of Anglo-Saxon intelligence be it said that, in spite of an occasional recrudescence of the earlier symptoms, in spite of the spasmodic efforts of capitalistic combinations to stamp out labor combinations, in spite of the exasperating follies by which trade unionism has at times exhausted the patience of a sympathetic public, there has never again been a serious or prolonged relapse of public opinion. On the contrary, there has been a steady growth of healthier public sentiment in regard to labor organizations, not only in England and America, but in other members of our great industrial family of nations.

It is largely for this reason that the exasperated and anomalous efforts of great combinations of capital to crush out the equally legitimate combinations of labor have always failed, as they deserve to fail.

It is largely for this reason, too, that the exasperating efforts of labor combinations to use the anarchic weapons

of coercion, violence, and mob rule have always failed, as they deserve to fail in a free country, where ultimate victory depends upon winning the approval of public opinion by the use of means which are consistent with the spirit of democratic institutions.

It is not to be inferred from what has been said that American trade unionism is the exact counterpart of the English movement which antedates it or that the typical trade unionism of England or America to-day is just what it was a quarter of a century ago. On the contrary, great differences in place and of time have produced differences of organization, although it may be said in passing that the original differences have been constantly minimized in recent years by the general tendency of trade unionism to simplify its work, leave most forms of insurance to more specialized and adequately equipped agencies, and concentrate its energies on the essential problem of trade organization and legislative regulation of industry.

It must be admitted, moreover, that the development of labor organization has been less satisfactory in America than in England,—less solid in growth, less serious in purpose, less conservative in method, less fortunate in leadership from within, less favored by sympathetic criticism, appreciation and suggestion from without.

Paradoxical as it may seem, the exceptionally fortunate economic conditions which have thus far surrounded American workmen sufficiently account for this inferiority of organization. For the essential condition of a successful trade-union movement is the existence of permanent groups of intelligent workmen, who have comparatively little opportunity to rise from the rank and file of labor to the coveted positions of commissioned officers and captains of industry in the great industrial army. Wherever the opportunities for promotion are great, the natural leaders and organizers—the workmen of brains and energy—are constantly deserting to the camp of capital, and becoming those self-made captains of industry who are apt to have so much trouble in dealing with their former comrades, and those merchant princes and titular members of our plutocratic peerage who often signally fail to command the loyal obedience of their industrial subjects. Consider for a moment the unprecedented demand for intelligence and organizing ability which the industrial expansion of the last half-century has made

upon the rank and file of American workmen. With such constant and wholesale promotions, the wonder is that any adequate ability remains for the Herculean task of organizing the heterogenous residuum of our foreign importations. The wonder is that with such constant skimming of the cream there is so much good material left to rise to the top.

But the peculiar economic conditions in the United States have effected the theoretical aspects of trade unionism even more radically than the practical aspects. For there has never been in this country the slightest trace of those Old World conditions of surplus population and excessive birthrate which are the corner-stone of these classic economic theories which for generations have enabled the complacent disciples of Malthus and Mill to confound and dismiss the aspirations of trade unionism with the naïve assertion that the laboring class cannot permanently improve its standard of living except by diminishing the birth-rate and so creating a scarcity of labor. In a country which has constantly found it necessary to supplement the infant immigration of labor from the other world by enormous hordes of full-grown immigrants from over the seas, intelligent workmen may be forgiven for not listening respectfully to a system of economic theories imported ready-made from Europe, and revolving in concentric vicious circles around the gratuitous assumption of an excessive birth-rate and a surplus laboring population which does not exist. The truth is that Anglo-American theories in regard to trade unionism have not repaid the cost of academic importation and dissemination; and they have richly deserved the contemptuous ridicule with which our intelligent working-people have regarded all such academic curiosities.

On the other hand, it is not to be assumed that all the purposes of trade unionism are commendable, or all their methods satisfactory. Far from it. The work which they undertake to do is difficult and delicate and of great public importance. It calls for thoroughly efficient organization, exceptional business ability, and a keen sense of social responsibility. If trade unions insist on undertaking these difficult and important negotiations, the commuity has a right to insist that they shall do the business well, with adequate guarantees of efficiency and good faith.

But all this means not less organization, but more; not

repression, but encouragement; not suspicion, but appreciative supervision and guidance. At present it is still painfully true that both in methods and in purposes, our combinations of labor have much to repent of and much to improve. But society is itself, in large part, responsible for the anarchic methods which have helped to make combination a synonym for crime. For outlaws are likely to be law-breakers. And, when a corporation or a trade union finds itself between economic necessity on the one hand and unreasonable statutes on the other, there is bound to be a choice of evils, an infraction of economic laws or statute laws. And, in this country, we have seen enough of the evil consequences of thus putting combinations between the devil and the deep sea.

In view of such facts, it is interesting to observe that in an hour of great national sorrow and humiliation, such as we are now passing through, we hear much from the representatives both of labor and of capital of the sacredness of law and order. The great combinations of labor hasten to pass denunciatory resolutions because the lawless weapons of Anarchy are used to strike down the visible head of our body politic. And they do well. But they shall do better if they themselves repent, and remember henceforth that all lawlessness and violence is anarchy and the prolific mother of anarchy in a free country.

In like manner the representatives of our great industrial and commercial combinations of capital vie with one another in expressing their loathing and detestation for the treasonable insanity which murders the sacred representative of law and order, and applies the savage methods of private vengeance to the redress of imaginary public wrongs. And they, too, do well. But let the captains of industry who are starving their mutinous forces into sullen submission remember that the resort to the forms of industrial warfare in which might determines right is only another name for the anarchy which proclaims that there is no adequate legal redress for certain grievances in modern society, and that it must therefore revert to the crude methods of private vengeance.

For with all our professed abhorrence for the enemies of law and order, the appalling fact remains that the Titanic struggles of rival combinations of labor and of capital, deadlocked like industrial leviathans in a grim and brutal struggle for supremacy, are still putting to

shame the alleged intelligence and morality and humanity of our twentieth-century civilization, are still imperilling the morality, the prosperity, and the industrial health, not of a single trade, not of a single nation merely, but of the whole international body economic. Such Titanic struggles put to shame our intelligence and morality because they abandon the rational, civilized, and legal methods of adjusting disputes, and revert to the brutal, primeval, biological logic which makes might the arbiter of right. They put to shame our democratic institutions, because they declare openly that no legal machinery can be set in motion to arbitrate the disputes of these great, composite pseudo-personalities, which have somehow grown so large and so strong that they have forgotten their filial obligations to the society to which they owe their origin and their continued existence.

And yet, why is the opening of the twentieth century confronted with such brutal spectacles? Why does modern society permit itself to be converted into an industrial prize ring, where the periodic bouts of capital and labor are fought to a finish with no referee to insure even the conventional amenities of civilized warfare, and no public authority with sufficient dignity, self-respect, and energy to stop the disgraceful fight? Why are the anarchic struggles of these industrial leviathans permitted to go on in an age when reason and justice are supposed to have replaced the blind and brutal laws of natural selection and rejection? Why in such crises does public opinion ebb and flow like the vacillating impulse of a moral coward? Why does democracy stand idly by with folded hands and sanctimonious complacency, while the sacred principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, are thus trampled in the anarchic mire of license, coercion, hate?

What, in short, is the trouble with our democratic civilization that it seems to hold so cheap the sacred principles of reason and justice, law and order? The trouble is twofold,—intellectual and moral. It comes from honest intellectual confusion, on the one hand, from blunted moral sensibility, on the other. Intellectual confusion and moral indifference,—these are the deadly constitutional maladies of which our industrial, social and political disorders are only symptoms and results. Intellectual confusion in regard to the fundamental laws of our composite social, industrial, and political life; moral indifference to the lofty and inspiring ideals of industrial, politi-

cal, and social liberty, equality, fraternity, upon which alone the mighty fabric of democratic civilization can be reared.

The origin of this intellectual and moral confusion is not hard to find. For the most characteristic development of our modern civilization is the industrial revolution of the past one hundred years. And for this very reason the most characteristic mental and moral features of our civilization are summed up in the industrial philosophy of the last one hundred years. It is this industrial philosophy which has poisoned the modern social system, and caused numberless disorders and incalculable distress. And what is this baneful philosophy? It is summed up in the simple, selfish, individualistic rule of Gold, which has replaced the Golden Rule, both in business conduct and in economic precept,—the simple rule of Gold,—"Do unto others that which you think it pays best to do." And, as for society, hands off, and let the strongest decide what it pays best to do to the weak.

This is the essence of the economic gospel with which deluded teachers poisoned the unformed mind of the nineteenth century. And the rich young century found the selfish teaching to its liking, and learned the lesson all too well. Here is the doctrine which infected our social system with those microbes of *laissez faire* which have befogged the Anglo-Saxon mind with chronic combination-phobia for a hundred years. Here is the explanation of that repression, suspicion, and apprehension which have hampered and thwarted and stunted and distorted the normal growth of labor organizations in the past, and to-day are unwittingly doing their best to make dangerous outlaws of the great capitalistic trusts and combinations, by acts of legislative repression which are often ludicrous and sometimes hysterical. Here, again, is the explanation of that criminal apathy of the public conscience which leads democracy to stand complacently by and wait for the struggling leviathans of capital and labor to solve industrial problems, and relieve the embarrassments of society by eating one another up, after the manner of the Kilkenny cats.

The grim and humiliating historic fact is that a hundred years ago Anglo-Saxon civilization had a new Adam and a new fall. And the new fall was the moral apostasy of our industrial civilization to the great ethical principles which are the most precious heritage which experi-

ence, science, reason, religion, have bequeathed to our race. And the grim fact still remains that our apostate civilization has not yet returned from following after false gods. It is still worshipping the Golden Calf which false prophets of economic selfishness set up in the wilderness of that unparalleled industrial and social revolution, which has swept away the landmarks of ancient tradition and dimmed the faith of our civilization in the eternal verities which reason, morality, and religion have declared to be the law of life for nations as well as for individual men. The industrial ideal of our civilization is still that hideous caricature of human nature, the economic man, whose creed is greed, whose Golden Rule of life is the Rule of Gold,—"Let each do unto others that which he thinks it pays best to do,"—and natural selection take the hindmost.

Our democracy is still hypnotized by the illusion that liberty means *laissez faire*, license, non-interference, unregulated competition.

Our Anglo-Saxon civilization is still mumbling in a confused, shamefaced, half-hearted way the obsolete, immoral, and discredited creed of competition and greed, without moral courage to face the truth, grapple with the real facts, and replace this degrading idolatry of the Golden Calf and economic man with the glorious and inspiring religion of social, political, and industrial democracy,— the religion of the liberty and equality of brothers; the religion of the great fraternal commonwealth, where combination, coöperation, and social self-seeking take the place of competition, industrial warfare, and individual self-seeking.

What is needed, therefore, is a new and right understanding of the situation. First of all, the public mind must be cleared of the hereditary economic heresy which makes combinations either of labor or of capital objects of distrust, evils to be throttled, diseases to be eradicated from the economic system. Instead of our half-hearted acceptance of the apostate creed of greed and chaotic strife, the public needs to know the real truth,—that selfishness is a biologic, economic, social, and political failure; that unregulated competition is the law of death, and not of life; that it means everywhere survival of the unfit,—the unfit employer, the unfit employee, the unfit type of industrial organization. For the real truth is that combination is the inevitable result of efforts to

escape the intolerable and suicidal conditions of unregulated competition, whether it be the "cut-throat competition" of producers bidding against each other in the dark for the custom of consumers or the hungry competition of workmen bidding against each other in the dark for the custom of employers, the opportunity to earn the daily bread of life for self and wife and child. In both cases it must be clearly understood that it is the buyers who have all the advantages, be they buyers of manufactured commodities on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the capitalistic buyers of that most perishable of all commodities, labor and skill, which must be sold day by day and hour by hour, or forever run to waste.

The groups of competing capitalists who produce and sell commodities, and the groups of competing workmen who produce and sell labor, are therefore inevitably driven to combine for the same reason, for the sake of mutual and legitimate protection against their own blind efforts to market what they have to sell.

Moreover, the public mind must be brought to understand that such combinations of sellers are not only an inevitable result of competition, but a legitimate and desirable result. For such a combination is not another name for the dreaded evils of avaricious and uncontrolled monopoly. On the contrary, it means legitimate organization; it means the substitution of plan for accident; it means economy; it means efficiency; it means responsibility for the quality as well as for the price of labor and of other commodities.

It is not to be supposed that there are no dangers inherent in even a recognized and normal method of industrial development by means of combination and coöperation. Far from it. Eternal vigilance is always the price of progress. Every stage of social evolution brings its dangers as well as its opportunities; brings its new responsibilities with new powers; brings new duties with new opportunities.

So combinations bring vastly greater economic and social opportunities, powers, responsibilities, duties, with the corresponding dangers of misused power and neglected duties and organized selfishness. But the dangers of the wastefulness and the injustice attendant upon a continuance of existing conditions of outlawry and strife are vastly greater than the dangers which could possibly inhere in a condition where the natural, normal, ethical,

rational conditions of economic progress are facilitated and guided and controlled rather than hindered and repressed.

There is no safety in mere repression or in any backward step. Rather than submit to the evils of unregulated competition both the sellers of labor and the sellers of other commodities will surely continue to defy both the theories, prejudices, and statutes of modern society. For it is easier to kick against the pricks of statute law than those of natural law. The world moves, and the economic and political anachronisms of a former century simply set a premium on lawlessness and make it pay best to do the socially, politically, and industrially disastrous things which we are familiar with to-day.

The outworn economic creeds of society must therefore be as radically revised and brought up to date as the old religious creeds; otherwise they will hinder progress instead of helping it.

The great body of citizens, in their capacity as consumers and legislators, must change completely their attitude toward combinations. Laws must be devised to assist and direct legitimate combination and co-operation, not to thwart it. Regulations must be enforced which assist those who are selling labor or other commodities to escape from the wasteful and disastrous conditions of blind competition, and retain their legitimate gains. For combination is not an economic crime, but a natural, normal, and irresistible phase of an industrial evolution which is passing from the lower plane of the blind competitive struggle for life to the higher plane of rational, humane, moral, efficient organization and co-operation. The function of legislation is not to hinder, but to assist this industrial and moral evolution by making it possible to adopt rational, moral, and humane methods, by making it pay best to adopt the socially best forms of organization, by removing the tremendous existing incentives to lawlessness and corruption.

Economic theory must also be brought into harmony with the real facts of life. The hideous caricature of human nature known as the self-seeking economic man must be replaced by the fraternal ideal of a brother man, working for the welfare of a great social, industrial, and political family. The creed of greed must be replaced by the creed of fraternity. The competitive law of strife, of sacrifice of weak to strong, must give place to the law of co-

operation, combination, mutual aid, rational devotion of strong to weak. The selfish economic rule of God—"Do unto others what it pays you best to do"—must be replaced by the Golden Rule of social self-seeking. The political rule of "grab" and "pull" and blackmail must be replaced by the ethical rule which makes it pay best to do the socially best thing.

This will remove the ban of outlawry, which is itself such a strong incentive to crime.

This will substitute a sentiment of social sympathy for the existing atmosphere of class distrust and critical discontent. This will secure the publicity and frankness of administrative method, which is the only guarantee of public security and confidence. In a word, the great remedy for the great evils of intellectual confusion and moral insensibility is more co-operation, more combination, more organization, more social and political regulation and direction for those whose low ideals would drag society down, more freedom and encouragement for those whose aspirations and ideals must lift society up.

All this will not bring the millennium, but it will bring something better than the millennium. It will substitute the spirit of co-operation for the spirit of hate. It will place society on the ascending road of endless social progress instead of on the descending broad highway which so many civilizations have followed to destruction. It will give meaning to the inspiring creed of our glorious political religion of democracy,—liberty, equality, fraternity,—the liberty and equality of brothers, of co-workers and joint heirs in the great fraternal commonwealth of which the poets and prophets and the sages all have dreamed. It will make our industrial organization an ethical system, our politics a religion, our common life sublime. The body politic and the body economic shall thus be knit together and animated by one common spirit,—the spirit of fraternal liberty and equality; the spirit of combination, co-operation, mutual service, devotion of strong to weak, fraternal love. So shall the future possibilities be better than any millennial retrospect. Capital and labor may not lie down together, like the lion and the lamb; but they shall work together as brothers in one economic household. So shall the liberty, equality of brothers, the social, industrial, political religion of democracy, be the creed of every citizen. Liberty, equality, fraternity,—these three. And the greatest of these is fraternity,—fraternal love.

TRUSTS OR THE CENTRALIZATION OF POWER.

BY PROF. JOHN B. CLARK.

When your secretary announced his intention of bringing you some good tidings, the first thought that occurred to me was that he was about to complete the bulletin which stands in the corridor of the United States Hotel, and announce that "Columbia" had won the race; and I was glad that that was the nature of the tidings, because it puts competition in a rather pleasant light and shows that persons can possibly engage in it without moral degredation. When one yacht wins, it does not follow that the owner of the other yacht will cherish envy, hatred and uncharitableness. I am obliged to say some good things about the competitive process,—not the process of unregulated selfishness and greed to which my friend Prof. Cummings has alluded; for on that I am in accord with him. We are, however, to contrast a system in which competition has ruled with a system in which it seems as though monopoly were about to rule; and I think that I rightly interpret the feeling of the country when I say that there is alarm at the subsidence of competition and the replacement of it by monopoly. For one thing is clear,—that competition has adjusted with a certain rude approach to equity the rewards of different departments of business. If one branch of production sells its product at a high price and another sells its product at a low price, capital has a fashion of moving from the less regarded to the better rewarded occupation. It adjusts the comparative wages of labor with a certain approximate justice; for, if one occupation is worse paid than another, there is a movement of labor from the one occupation to the other, and the adjustment puts them upon a general plane of equality. If you substitute monopoly, prices will be at the mercy of corporations, which, however promising their original announcements may be, exist for their own gain. The wages of labor will also be to a certain extent at the mercy of some type of corporation, and we shall sigh for a return of the regulating principle under which up to this time we have managed to live.

The problem in connection with trusts is whether they do

or do not annihilate competition. Centralization has come to stay. Our great corporations will not be forcibly or peaceably divided into a multitude of little ones, and we shall never again have scores and hundreds of competing shops. The great establishment will stay by virtue of its economy; and it will stay, I hope, by virtue of certain finer effects than mere economy. It is the first crude thought of the people that centralization is monopoly, and the natural impulse is to destroy centralization in order to crush monopoly. I frankly confess that, if the only way to save competition were to stop the concentration of capital, there would be much to be said in favor of doing it. Monopoly is almost wholly evil. Fortunately, this is not the only alternative. Between centralization and monopoly there is a rift so narrow that the people as a whole do not perceive it, and yet it makes the difference between two wholly different and sharply contrasted series of effects. Genuine monopoly means high prices of goods and low wages of labor, as it is crowded into a few open fields. It means less antagonism in all the commercial and manufacturing centres. It means low prices for raw materials creating antagonism between the agricultural and the manufacturing parts of our country. It means a serious strain upon our democracy and a reversal of the moral judgments we have heretofore pronounced upon our system industrially as well as politically. If, however, centralization does not mean monopoly,—if a thoroughly sound type of competition, unlike the former type, but equally effective for good, shall still survive the creation of these corporations,—then we shall have the regulative principle still acting, and giving some approach to fairness in the distribution of the rewards of industry. There will be larger fields for the investment of savings, more savings to invest, and—I devoutly hope—in the long run a more fraternal relation between the different classes that make up our composite body politic.

Now what is the actual fact as to the extent of the monopoly which these conditions have developed? It is theoretically possible that a single corporation might have exclusive possession of the field, and yet there should not be a trace of genuine monopoly in its conduct. This is not because such a corporation is ever an altruistic body. Nobody is gullible enough to take at its face value any protestation of altruistic purposes that the promoters of a trust might publicly make. They are here for their own

gain, estimated in dollars and cents. They get all they can; and, if they do not get more, it is because they cannot. And the reason they cannot is a reason we need to understand. It is the existence of that rift between centralization and monopoly of which I have already spoken. Centralization has not brought with it the degree of monopolistic power that they desire, and their control of the market is never more than partial. There is usually free and independent production in some portion of the field. Moreover, if the trust raises prices unduly, competition which does not now exist will spring quickly into existence, and will bring prices to a normal level. With one single exception, all the great early trusts went to pieces on this rock. They put the prices too high, and acted as if they were the monopolists they thought themselves. They found they were not, since their action called independent mills by the score into existence. Prices went down, and the trusts went through that operation which by a happy euphemism is called "reorganization." [Laughter.] Trusts have learned that they cannot manipulate wages or prices at their pleasure. They are, indeed, partial monopolies, since within certain limits they can raise prices; and the competition which does not yet exist cannot instantly begin its work of reducing them. Yet the large amount of competition that already does exist and the potential competition, or that which higher prices will call into existence, act together to keep prices where they are.

Now the two tendencies which are now at work are toward more centralization, on the one hand, and a powerful curbing of the power, or a closer and closer regulation of the centralized bodies, by means of this surviving and potential competition on the other; and the outcome is to be decided by the relative strength of the two movements. The trusts will try to overcome potential competition in the various ways that are open to them by reason of their great size. The potential competitor may hesitate to become an actual one, when he is likely to be bullied and terrorized the moment he appears in the field; and bullying and terrorizing are arts which the trusts are learning to practise. A great trust can invade a particular corner of the country where a small producer is operating, and can sell goods in that particular corner at less than they cost, and keep the prices up elsewhere. It can make money itself, while preventing its rival from making any.

It can put him where, in good time, as the manager of a trust once told me, "the sheriff would have him." I have elsewhere referred to a particular case that chanced not long ago to come under my knowledge of a producer who had special facilities for putting certain goods upon a local market more cheaply than the trust could furnish them; and yet the trust was selling the goods at a price he could not compete with, and he was seeing his capital vanish. He went to the head of the trust, with whom he was personally acquainted, and said, "Don't you see that in this particular corner of the field I can produce goods more cheaply than you can?" "And don't you see," said the other, "that, if I lose money in twenty cities and make money in two hundred cities, I come out ahead?" He did come out ahead. My friend had to go out of business, and his plant was bought by the trust for a nominal sum. Potential competition is working with somewhat doubtful efficiency, and the problem is whether that efficiency will increase or diminish and whether the resultant tendency will be toward monopoly, with unbearable evils in its train, or toward a beneficent type of competition.

Now some of the measures proposed take no account whatever of the distinction between centralization and monopoly. The measures that undertake to crush the trust altogether are of that type. They assume that a great trust is a great monopoly, and therefore, on *prima facie* evidence, a thing to be crushed. They will crush it. If law could accomplish it, they would be crushed in many places.

There is another measure which illustrates the same failure to preserve a distinction between two things that are by no means identical. It is proposed to sweep away the protective tariff in so far as it applies to the goods made by trusts. Time is not long enough, and this occasion is not the proper one to discuss this to the full extent. But some things may clearly be said about it without getting upon doubtful ground. This is a measure for exposing not the trust merely, but the industry as a whole, to a certain pressure of foreign competition. If it reduces the prices charged by the trust, it will reduce the prices paid by the independent producer. It will have no tendency to rescue the independent producer from the attack of the trust. On the other hand, it will put the independent producer in a still more perilous position; for the trust has a chance to save itself by forming some kind of com-

bination with the foreigner. Thus far trusts have not often crossed international boundaries, and have scarcely ever crossed the ocean. The inducements to such a combination would be enormously increased by this particular measure. If, on the other hand, you can take the monopolistic element out of the action of the trusts,—if you can widen the rift between centralization and monopoly and make so much of surviving and potential competition as to regulate prices without touching the tariff,—then what is going to happen? The trusts themselves will become the advocates of a revision that will greatly reduce duties, for they will cater vigorously to foreign markets. Having no power to get enormous profits at home, which might make them indifferent to the foreign markets, they will turn to them for the enlargement of their sales. A monopoly might be unwilling to surrender a protective duty for the sake of increasing its business. It might be a better policy to sell only a hundred million dollars worth of goods, so long as a company could make twenty-five million dollars on them, than to sell two hundred million dollars worth and make less. Enlargement of a business is not necessarily beneficial, if the rate of profit greatly falls. But, if the rate of profit were already fixed at a fair level by surviving and potential competition, then the enlargement of the business would be a matter of great moment, and the trust would strive vigorously to secure a foreign trade. It is important then, in this aspect, to widen the rift between centralization and monopoly, and to make all we can of this potential competition. It is a method of enlisting trusts themselves in support of a policy of reciprocity.

There is still another remedy that is proposed, and that takes no account of the important distinction on which a sound policy is based. It is State socialism. Let the State take every industry that is in the hands of a trust. If it become hopelessly monopolistic, there would be many persons not now socialists who would say "Amen" to the proposition; but, if it did not do so, the arguments against the socialistic experiment would hold. It is not necessary here to present it, particularly in view of the general feeling of the American people on the subject. Industries in general will not be nationalized.

What else can we do? Nothing? *Laissez faire?* By no means. But a policy which looks like *laissez faire* is sometimes very unlike it in its practical effects. And it

so happens that I have ventured to present a certain policy for which I anticipate for some time no very ardent support, and I now have only time barely to indicate what it is. The essence of it is the rescue of the independent producer,—not from any fair competition to which he may be subjected, but from the competition of the unfair, predatory type to which any small producer is bound to succumb. A trust will get favors from the railroads which a small producer cannot get. One thing to be done is to stop that, and this is not easy. Good things are not more easy in this connection than they usually are. But we must find or make a way to repress the favoritism whereby a large producer can get a rate of freight which a small producer cannot hope for. If there were no other weapons in the hands of the trust, this alone would make the subsistence of this independent competitor very uncertain. I venture to think that in time we shall repress this evil. I think that sooner or later we shall ordain that not only railroads, which are now enjoined by the law from personal discriminations, but monopolisitc corporations of every sort shall not make discriminations of that type. We should thus veto the action of the men who would go into Colorado and sell paper at less than it would cost to make it for the sake of breaking up the business of the paper manufacturer in Denver. We should ordain that, if they will sell their paper at that ruinous price in Denver, they must sell it at the same price everywhere else. [Applause.] And, if they do that, they cannot stand the competition longer than the Denver mill. We shall ordain that what is called the factor's agreement shall be formally outlawed. The trust sometimes boycotts a man who sells any goods manufactured by a rival, and the retail dealer is thus obliged to confine his transactions to the trust. It may have command of some brand of goods which he must have, and a refusal to give him those goods then brings him to terms. If, as is probably true, the factors' agreement is condemned already under common law, I suspect it will be more explicitly under statute law. These laws will be most difficult of enforcement. We already have statutes that are not easily enforced, and American lawyers have developed phenomenal skill in "driving a coach and four" through them. If our dependence were entirely upon statutes, we might encounter that difficulty, and make slow progress. I will not admit that we should not make any progress, though the rate might be discouraging.

Fortunately we have another resource. Monopoly is illegal already under common law, and the only reason why this law is held in partial abeyance is because the courts have no very clear definition of monopoly to apply to specific cases. What is technically a monopoly? Is it a concern which is big enough to control the greater part of the output of goods of a certain kind, and to exercise a dominating influence over the remainder? Well, how is this dominating influence gained? There are certain specific acts which secure it; and these acts have on them the stamp of monopoly, and will make any corporation amenable to the old legal principle. Any one of these acts of predatory competition is proof positive of an essentially illegal purpose. If I sell goods cheaply in Colorado obviously for the sake of destroying competition there, it is for the sake of creating a monopoly. These various and sundry acts which a statute may forbid, but find difficulty in preventing, are all of them the clearest indications of a monopolistic purpose on the part of the corporation that performs them. Let statutes specify and forbid such acts, and let courts vigorously enforce the law against monopoly wherever such acts are performed. The commerce law will remove the monopolistic element that inheres in centralization.

Now I want to say just a word on the moral judgment which we should pronounce on a general system in which competition rules. There is no doubt whatever that this particular plan of regulation which I have advocated depends upon competitive force, and by resorting to it we incur at once the suspicion of reviving a power which, whatever its effects may be in the economic realm, has been sometimes regarded as liable to a certain moral condemnation. Is it not based upon selfishness? Is not the theoretical system that advocates it the apotheosis of greed? If it were, I should not venture here or anywhere to defend it. There is another rift to be taken into account which is not altogether easy to see. It is the moral rift between selfishness, pure and simple, and a certain regulated self-interest that respects the rights of others. There may be a self-seeking impulse in both cases, and unquestionably there is. There is a self-seeking interest in the contest going on or lately completed between two certain yachts not far from New York Bay. Crude, unregulated selfishness is not the attitude of these contestants, and unregulated selfishness is not in any normal competitive process.

What has normal competition given us? It has given a general approach to honesty in the apportionment of the rewards of industry. I am not speaking of individual honesty, but of the honesty of the body as a whole. I would like to test the great social organism of which we are parts, simply as an individual character might be tested. It has been accused of total depravity, as individuals were once accused of it; and, if I understand the meaning of the term "total depravity," the indictment is like in the two cases. For what is said of the competitive system, not by my friend Prof. Cummings, but by some people, is that it makes a system fundamentally bad. The totally depraved man would be one whose fundamental character would be bad. His governing purpose would be evil; and, notwithstanding any amount of good that he might incidentally do, he would at heart be a bad man. If his governing purpose were good, he would be a good man, notwithstanding any amount of evil that he might do. I should not like to take a brief for the defence of society from the accusation of doing evil. I should confess judgment on that point; but I should be very willing to make a plea that the fundamental character of society is righteous, and that this comes about partially through the self-seeking impulse, which shows itself in business in the form of competition, provided that impulse is properly regulated by the sense of justice. Now competition under proper restraint has given us a certain honesty in the apportionment of the rewards of industry; and by that I mean that a man's pay tends to approximate what he produces. If a man comes into my mill and offers me his services, he has in his hands a certain potential product which he offers me for sale. His presence will increase the output of the mill. It can make more goods so long as the man is there; and, when I sell those goods, I can pay him. The effect of perfectly free competition is to make me give him all that these extra goods are worth. The effect of monopoly would be to make me keep part and give him the remainder. The rift between competition and monopoly makes the difference between honesty and dishonesty in the apportionment of the rewards of labor. It also makes the difference between progress and stagnation, for a monopoly would not be progressive. If the great consolidations are not monopolies, they will be progressive and will be sharply on the alert to have the latest and best machinery. Their competitors, actual

or potential, will force them to this course, since they cannot otherwise hold possession of their field. The great consolidation that is a secure monopoly will hold on to its antiquated machinery and will be less alert for new inventions. The difference between competition and monopoly even under the régime of consolidation, is the difference between progress and stagnation.

The competitive system has in it the possibility of an exceeding virile type of democracy and fraternity. The truest is one that subsists under some difficulties. If there is progress, that registers itself in continually rising pay for labor. If it shows itself in increasing comfort and increasing culture for the working-class and in a kindlier relation between classes, I care not how soon a multi-millionaire becomes a billionaire and all the others of his class follow suit. Fraud, the diverting the incomes of other men into the millionaire's pocket, is a very different matter. I am speaking of honest production, of the increase of the gross capital of society and a rise in the rate of wages. From my point of view this means to the workingman more than getting two dollars a day where he has been getting a dollar and a half. It means that in genuine comforts he is gaining on the very rich. To a man who has ten million dollars there is small advantage in acquiring a hundred. Would you compare the progress that a man makes when, starting with ten millions, he gets one hundred with that of the man who, starting with a dollar and a half, gets two dollars? It signifies great gain in the way of comfort for the poor man. But how much additional comfort and culture does the rich man get? How many good things did he forego while he lived in such poverty as a fortune of ten millions entailed? What particular good thing except a larger measure of vulgar display can he allow himself when he gets one hundred million? It means to him practically nothing, but the fifty cents a day means a great deal to a man who gets it for the first time. As the rich man gains in dollars the poor man gains more in real advantages.

Progress in a normal and healthy state means the drawing together of classes, if gains be measured by standards of actual comfort and culture; it means the possibility of manliness and self-respect without the possession of great wealth; it means a return to a type of life in which the poem of the "Village Blacksmith" would not represent something which seems to have been born in the poet's imagination.

If you look forward to the ultimate consummation of things, what do you say? Fraternity? Yes; but is it a fraternity which shall subsist because there is no chance of envy? Will it require that all men should be on the same economic level? Is it to be a type of fraternity in which there will be no chance for hate because there are no rivalries to engender hatred? Will there be no differences in the progress of different individuals because there will be none of the struggles which create progress? For my part, I would give indefinitely more for that fraternity which can subsist in spite of any possible differences of wealth than I would for that which is dependent upon the reduction of all classes to a plane of equality. [Applause.] And I would give indefinitely more for a brotherly love which exists between men engaged in the sharpest rivalries of business than I would for that type of brotherly love which can only subsist if there are never rivalries at all. It is to a virile type of brotherhood, to the highest conceivable fraternity, that the system actuated by a well regulated competition is, in my judgment, tending. [Applause.]

THE UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

THE CHILD, THE CHURCH, AND THE CITIZEN.

BY REV. GEORGE BATCHELOR.

The subject proposed to me is not one concerning the salvation of the child in some future state, nor any specific preparation for the passage from this life to other forms of life which lie beyond, out of our sight. My subject is narrowed to the one point: How shall the church, acting through the Sunday-school, most economically spend its energy in the attempt to make out of its children good citizens, honorable men and women, who shall hold themselves ready always for public service,—men and women who shall carry into the administration of affairs, whether in government, in the control of business, or in the relations of social life, the principles of righteousness, which are never in our thought separated from the sentiment and practice of religion?

Much attention is paid by the church and those who represent it to the conduct of those public personages who represent us in public life, in the management of great business affairs, and in the leadership of society. We all hold ourselves responsible for the character of our government and the conduct of our public men. We praise, we blame, we advise, and we criticise ourselves and one another, whenever public affairs are not to our liking. All this strenuous thought and feeling has its due effect in the creation of a sound public opinion. But the very earnestness of our efforts in this direction, the intensity of our feeling, and the energy expended in the attempt to influence the course of affairs in public life, often withdraw our attention from a duty and an opportunity of vastly greater importance, which lie unnoticed close at hand.

In every one of our Unitarian churches the probability is very great that there are boys and girls who, before the century has passed its first quarter, will take their places to render eminent service in public life. It is certain

that several of them will, in their local communities, be energetic and influential leaders of society and masterful captains of industry. Now why do we wait until these children have, in some haphazard way, stumbled into their places, carrying with them a few reminiscences of preaching, teaching and religious influence in the church, which by some miracle of character-building become principles of conduct in later life?

If I call your attention to some well-known and well-worn facts, which show the influence of our churches in the production of good citizens, you will pardon me if I omit boasting on account of them, and lay these things upon your hearts and consciences as occasions not for self-congratulation, but for blame and self-reproof. A brief recital of the facts may run in this way: There is, in no State of the Union, a Unitarian church so small that it may not probably produce men and women eminent for their public service. To take an example at random: in the State of Illinois, out of small churches have come a governor of the commonwealth, a reform mayor of Chicago, members of the national Senate and House of Representatives, a judge of the Supreme Court at Washington, with local legislators and public servants not a few. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, mayors of cities, governors of the Commonwealth, members of both houses in Congress, cabinet officers and presidents of the United States, have been in a continuous line, since the early part of the last century, produced by our churches; and many of the most illustrious were faithful, not only to their local congregations, but to the service of the Sunday-school in which they taught, or served as superintendents.

I do not mention these things because they are unknown. On the contrary, we have boasted overmuch of these products of our religious culture, the good fruits of our churches. But why not boast? If we have done a good thing, why not tell of it? Why not let men see our good works, that they may glorify our Father in heaven? The reason why in this case boasting is excluded is because these, which we make the show-pieces of our exhibition, are the rare examples, the sports, the variations, the accidental fruits that show what, with good seed and a fertile soil, we might do if our cultivation of human life were as thoughtful, careful and skilful as our cultivation of cabbages and strawberries.

Now, please, gentle hearer, do not hark back to the doc-

trine of heredity, and say you must catch and train the ancestors of a man before you can make him wise and good. The doctrine of heredity, rightly understood, is the basis of all our knowledge of human progress. But, also, from the days of the prophet Ezekiel to our own time that doctrine has been the refuge of the lazy, the incompetent, and the ignorant. We use it as a blanket to cover out of sight the hideous and preventable sins which infest society,—sins which may be as certainly understood and as easily prevented as yellow fever and the lockjaw.

The lesson we have learned is that, in vegetable and animal life, whatever has come by accident may be produced by design. Whether it be a peach, a flower, or a cat, whatever has been once produced can be produced again. When a rare fruit appears, its owner rejoices at the discovery of it. He shows it with pride, and enjoys its excellence. But by those who know how fruits grow and are improved he would be accounted a fool if he should stop with that. First of all, he asks himself: How shall I make this rare fruit common, how cause it to multiply and perpetuate itself? Heredity has done its work for this rare fruit and for the worthless stocks that bear no fruit. But now the cunning cultivator will cheat heredity with slip and bud and graft; he will make his one precious tree into a thousand; he will make the common stocks around him support the new and richer life transferred from the parent stock.

So in human life, after heredity, of which the work ceases at the cradle, has transmitted the inheritance of the past, the present steps in with its innumerable and immeasurable influences to work upon the human soul,—a substance more easily worked and shaped by proper influences than anything which comes to the hand of the cultivator or the artist. Many facts might be cited to show the immediate and vast power of training and external influence in the building of character. But time fails. Let one fact of common knowledge illustrate. Everybody knows that in great crises of stress, and strain, and human need some leader of men is apt to appear, some Joan of Arc or Abraham Lincoln, some person unknown at the beginning, but afterward called great. Now the crisis which produces the leaders of men does not wait to see that they are provided with proper ancestors. It takes them just as they are, and fits them for the purpose in hand. At such a time we have possibilities, ideals, pressing needs, and the world of human life. Out of

these material wants creates the men. If in these things there is any one deliverance of Divine Providence which is written large and can be understood when we stop to think about it, it is that these extraordinary individuals are given us as specimens, as samples, as patterns, as models to work by, as types of character to be reproduced on a larger scale in the calmness of a well-ordered life. What can be produced under pressure can be better produced by deliberation, by precept, by influence, by atmosphere. We cannot make men and women alike in external form and feature; but, happily, the soul has no physical features and does not depend upon the shape of its tenement. The greatest moral qualities are the most commonplace, and they can be drawn out in human life in any combination for which there is a universal demand.

If all the men and women of any congregation, be it large or small, should accept as a fact that which has been abundantly shown in experience, that the whole public and private life of the next generation will be determined by the influence exerted upon the boys and girls in their homes, their week-day schools, and their Sunday-schools before they are eighteen years of age, this feeble impulse which now lends itself to the moral and religious education of the young, will become a swelling flood, lifting every institution of society to a higher level.

We cannot make Abraham Lincolns six feet four inches high, with other features to match; but men of that type of character we might produce in abundance if we loved and honored and reverenced and rewarded men of that type. That which appears written all over the surface of the national life, whether good or evil, indicates exactly that which in their secret hearts millions of men and women have really honored and cherished. When evil appears on the surface, and for very shame we rise up to criticise and condemn, we shape in a moderate degree public opinion and the events which make history, without, however, greatly changing the deeper impulses of the national life. But the influence for which I am pleading, which may be exerted upon the young in our Sunday-schools and churches, shapes the national life and all its institutions from the roots upward. If every boy and girl in every one of our congregations knew that, going out into the world, there was an organization at home that expected great things of its children, that it would note their successes and rejoice in their moral achievement, what an impulse of moral good health would be felt in all

the ranks of society! Music, art, a knowledge of sacred literature, are accomplishments graceful and beautiful. But their full work is not done until they have reached the centres of life and stirred the impulses which create character.

What do the majority of the families of a congregation expect the Sunday-school to do for their children? Almost nothing. What do they ask the Sunday-school to do for their children? Almost nothing. Do they care whether the Sunday-school does or does not take an important part in the religious education and moral training of their children? Hardly at all. Commonly, the hopes and expectations of parents who send or permit their children to attend Sunday-schools do not rise much above the level of the Chinese laundryman who goes to a mission Sunday-school to learn the English language. They hope their children will make some pleasant acquaintances and share with them some refining influences, that they will learn to sing, get some slight acquaintance with the Bible, keep out of mischief on Sunday, and get on the right side of the social line which divides decent church-goers from the multitude, which has no holy day, and get some pleasure which will make Sunday less dreary and monotonous. But, excepting in each congregation a few men and women of rare devotion and radiant faith, nobody seems to know or care whether the Sunday-school shall have for its final cause picnics and dancing parties or serve its high purpose as a training school.

If the Sunday-school has any place in modern life, it must be regarded as the training school in which every boy and girl in the congregation shall come under the influence of all that is best in the men and women around them, and all that we can bring to bear upon them from the history of the past. Children are hero-worshippers, and are quick to catch the meaning of great examples. What would happen if at the age of eighteen our boys and girls went out from the Sunday-school trained by the example of heroic lives to tell the truth, to value a dollar honestly earned more than a gold mine won by fraud, to have definite ideals of character in which the conspicuous traits were a desire to be useful in the world, a keen sense of personal honor and reverence for all that is greatest and best in human life?

Now, without laborious training and more work laid upon the tender minds of children, already too much under

the harrow of modern education, this work could be done for the children of any congregation which was fairly possessed with the idea that the citizens of the future are to come out of the churches, and for better or for worse are to be what the churches make them. If with longing, love, and sympathy, with intelligence and the willingness to give a little time to the process, the congregation should surround its youth with the atmosphere of attentive good will, it would do its most effective work for good government, honest business, and a beautiful social order.

THE PLACE OF IMAGINATION IN RELIGIOUS AND MORAL EDUCATION.

BY CLARA BANCROFT BEATLEY.

President Charles W. Eliot, in his address upon "The Education of our Boys and Girls," emphasizes the value of poetry as a vehicle of religious instruction. This address, delivered at the Ministers' Institute at Worcester, is now in the ninth series of American Unitarian Association tracts. It should be in the hands of all parents and teachers and of all others who have the religious education of our young people at heart.

In a simple way, President Eliot shows us that "poetry believed in is religion," and makes it clear that a child will unconsciously get religion out of poetry that has been wisely selected with definite aim in view.

All the great ideas so precious to our religious faith,—Fatherhood, brotherhood, leadership, character, progress, truth, worship, service, freedom, union,—may be unconsciously imbibed through the medium of well-chosen poetry.

Now poetry is the language of the imagination and of strong emotion. The poet *sees* clearly. His

> "eye doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven;
> And, as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown; the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name."

The poet lifts his eye, and, lo!—

> "A world above man's head to let him see
> How boundless might his soul's horizon be!
> How it were good to live there and be free!"

The poet thinks deeply and feels profoundly. What other feeling is so strong as the feeling which comes from thinking, and becomes *Emotion?* Perfect poetry supplies the elements of imagination and emotion,—the potential forces that make for character. Through the imagination, it has the power to create the glowing ideals that allure desire. Through emotion it arouses and communicates the emotion which impels right choice and activity.

May we not say that true poetry carries within itself an epitome of life's philosophy, providing through emotion for all that splendid training of the will which secures right habit and gives power "to circumvent heredity, cheat chance, and conquer Nature," and providing, through imagination, for that glory of ideal and aroused desire which crave and compel fulfilment?

Emotion, through the will, grants unto man ("a little lower than the angels") "a crown of glory and of honor." Imagination, through vision and desire, raises man above the region of the will into the purely angelic heights that forestall heaven.

Is there a greater work in the world to do than to awaken this holy desire,—to create the "hunger and thirst after righteousness," which has only to exist to be filled? The imagination is the ideal faculty: it creates the vision of loveliness. Memory holds for us our past mental states just as they were. Imagination takes these past mental states and forms them into new combinations,—into ideals. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be"; but the imagination takes a strand of beauty here and another there and yet another yonder, and weaves the mysterious pattern of loveliness which continually advances before our lives,—the unrealized self, reaching out and up, beyond our grasp, forever luring us on to attainment. Man grows, and his ideal grows. It is to-day's ideal that he cannot reach, and for the yesterday's he will not stoop. Oh that every boy and girl in our land might have this guiding, illuminating vision, so that

> **"The coinage of his brain**
> **Shall not be forms of stars, but stars;**
> **Nor pictures pale, but Jove and Mars"!**

Whence comes this vision? "Knowest thou what wove yon wood-bird's nest?" Let us picture ourselves in our homes, in our schools, in our churches, yea, in our streets and in our shops, and seek therein the divine forms and colorings that have entered into the ideals of our lives. Throughout our land's length and breadth may be found many a hallowed home of illuminating and inspiring beauty,—a mother's cheery face, a father's courageous voice, the strong and womanly graces of a sister, the gentle manliness of a brother. The meeting-ground of our young people from Sunday to Sunday,—can we not close our eyes and see that lovely throng of throbbing life in the midst of its holy surroundings?

What is it that most endures? Is it that stirring picture of "Tobias and the Angels" with its glory of motion and form or that marvel of sculpture breathing forth living power and beauty? Is it the face of a Freeman Clarke or an Andrew, a Channing or a Parker? Or is it the inspiring line of a hymn?

"No power on earth shall sever
My soul from truth forever."

"Our fathers' faith, we'll sing of thee."

"He hides within the lily
A strong and tender care."

"I little see, I little know;
Yet can I fear no ill."

Is it from these fine hymns of a Savage, a Chadwick, a Gannett, and a Hosmer that the silent building grows? Or is it the power of the spoken word and the illuminated face, as with one accord the service of the heart finds reverent outward expression?

"For ye, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

"A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another even as I have loved you."

"Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant."

Not from any one of these alone, indeed, does "the mind become a mansion for all lovely forms," but subtly, mysteriously, the image-making faculty is at work, drawing and appropriating from each one of those external forms of loveliness the power and beauty that the informing spirit needs. Oh that in youth this brilliant, imaginative faculty might be fed most lavishly with the forms of real beauty! Feed, it must incessantly, either for the upbuilding, or, alas! and alas! for the levelling and depression of character. Which shall it be? Oh, arise, all ye guardians of youth, ye parents and teachers, ye poets and preachers, all ye men and women of vision and of power, and be ye ministering spirits, yea, angels and archangels. Oh, this strongly throbbing, impetuous, impatiently beautiful youth! How it glows with the consciousness of newly awakened powers! How blissfully conscious of passion's sway and of men's law! How it takes "the wings of the morning," and flies to the uttermost parts of

the earth,—yea, to the very heavens,—and knows neither the dangers nor the safeguards of the way! Shall we startle the lovely dreamer? Shall we ridicule his flowery illusions and bring him down to fact? Nay, let the youth dream on, building his beautiful air-castles higher and higher. We will show him how to lay his foundations, how to make secure the perilous "ladder leaning on the cloud." Imagination must be held in check, must "serve, not rule the poised mind." Its greatness is in service. All of nature, poetry, music, art, history, and dramatic literature,—sources of creative power and enticing beauty,—are at hand, and at command to allure this easily entreated faculty into its proper and reasonable service. Illusion loses its chance to cheat and to cloud when the real things of life are disclosed in their beauty. Distorted images and illusions come with poverty of mind. Reality is the soul of vision, the motive of all the fine moulding and subtle coloring that translates reality into ideality, earth into heaven. To see things as they are is to see things lifted into vision. The dreamy child must be fed with realities. Thus shall his dreams come true.

Our educational institutions, too long ignoring the foremost place of the imaginative faculty, are grandly awakening to their opportunities. Nature study, with all its power to impress the mind with quietness and beauty, takes a leading part in the school curriculum. Works of art are beautifying the walls of our school-rooms. The Perry pictures are making it possible for every home in our land to possess the world's great masterpieces. The art and literature that were once a luxury are now a necessity. Our Unitarian Sunday-school Society has been alive to its opportunities, and the elevation of thought which come to all our young people through choicely chosen pictures cannot be overestimated. The memorizing of fine passages from the Bible, especially of those dramatic passages which stir the imagination,—the high discourse of Abraham and Lot, "Let there be no strife between thee and me, for we are brethren"; Jacob's dream, with its convincing imagery, "This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven"; the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria and with the rich young man; the blessing of little children, the glowing speech of Paul at Areopagus,—these are but hints of the untold wealth of Bible poetry and story which waits (alas! too often upon ourselves) for the kindling of imaginative fire. Our greatest need in the way of re-

ligious publication is for an abridged Bible which shall maintain historical sequence of events, while it preserves all that is noble in literature,—a Bible that we shall long to replace in every home and school of our land! Oh that the first National Conference of the twentieth century would take the initiative in thought and in feeling which should speed the glorious day!

To Bible poetry as a means of stimulating the imagination we add the glowing messages of the poets and the prophets of a later day. The four stanzas of Emerson, commemorative of Concord Bridge:—

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

"The foe long since in silence slept;
Alike the conqueror silent sleeps;
And Time the ruined bridge has swept
Down the dark stream which seaward creeps.

"On this green bank, by this soft stream,
We set to-day a votive stone;
That memory may their deed redeem,
When, like our sires, our sons are gone.

"Spirit, that made those heroes dare
To die, and leave their children free,
Bid Time and Nature gently spare
The shaft we raise to them and thee."

What finer patriotic touch can we give to young hearts than that? Add to this the fine passage of Longfellow which portrays our "Ship of State"; the vision of Tennyson which lights the path of duty and glory; the tender, truthful messages of a Whittier; the glowing page of a Lowell. The hours with our young people are all too short to communicate our precious treasures.

The realm of story lends its charm. From Judea's hills and plains with their marvellous stories of the Christ, through the whole westward march of humanity, the page of history burns with heroic deeds. We may keep the bridge with Horatius of old, and stand with Arnold von Winkelried at his unflinching post. We may stoop for the dying words of a Sydney, as he passes the cup of cold water beyond his own parched lips. We cross the sea with the Pilgrim Fathers and endure the terrible hardships of a cruel winter. We share the prayerful vigils of Washington at Valley Forge. We bleed with our country's martyrs.

Not less the page of fiction serves. Every true novel has within itself the power to change life. Dr. Hale might have written a powerful appeal to patriotism in didactic form; but how much stronger is the indirect appeal to be made through the stirring adventures of Philip Nolan, "the man without a country"! Who has forgotten the thrill of Romola's return to Tito, at the bidding of Savonarola, or the start given to the heart-currents by that supreme act of sacrifice (nay, better say that supreme act of possession) which enabled Sidney Carton to face death, and say, "It is a far, far better thing that I do than I have ever done; it is a far, far better rest that I go to than I have ever known"?

These thrilling passages which appeal to our adult minds may be matched by similar stirring crises in the best of our juvenile literature. "Little Women," that classic for boys and girls, abounds in healthy dramatic situations that search the very heart of the youthful reader; "Jackanapes," that ideal hero of our young boys, is eloquent in its appeal to noble sacrifice; Jane Andrews's books, "The Seven Little Sisters" and "Each and All," are charming preachers of the brotherhood and sisterhood; and Mary P. Wells Smith, in her "Jolly Good Times" series, fires the youthful imagination and makes the heart glow for all true and lovely living. Many of the books which elders choose for children do not reach the child. The parent who is now consciously going over childhood's road cannot put himself into the place of the child with his blissful unconsciousness. The test of the book is the child. If it wins him to read it o'er and o'er, then it has preaching power.

But would you turn all religious and moral education into story-telling, you ask me? No, not that; but I would make choice selections of dramatic force, and I would repeat them constantly. We may repeat a classic in literature as we repeat a symphony of Beethoven. We never weary of the Pantheon and the Pyramids. We err when we flood our young people with stories of an indifferent nature, and fail to give to them the rare classics that throb with the life of ages. It is not enough that the child listens to a story. It should become a part of brain and heart. He must be able to reproduce it, bringing out the elements that give color and life. It then becomes a constant feeder of his imagery.

So much importance attaches itself to the creation of the ideal that I have dwelt upon this department of my

subject. There are other fascinating avenues that invite the willing mind: the power to picture the surroundings of another, to enter into his inner life and know his strength and weakness, and through imagination to feel his joy and woe; the need to create forms of beauty in loving, obedient work, as well as to feed upon them; the effect of symbols is stirring the imagination, making a single word a sign for a volume: This ring, — it is my home! This flag,—it is my country!

> "This crust is his body, broken for thee;
> This water, his blood, that died on a tree."

A whole chapter in itself is the part that fear has played in furnishing the mind with distorted images and veiling ages in irreligious gloom. Too long the world has been crippled by fear. We fear to think, to trust our own visions. We "take no step until the event is known."

Oh for the constant call to our young people of a religion of confidence and cheer, that bids them each new day lift up their heads and say courageously: "O God, thou art with us. Whom and what shall we fear? We are omnipotent with thee"! Thus shall the spirit be glorified with vision, thus shall desire pale before desire, thus shall the bond go free!

THE BIBLE IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY REV. J. H. CROOKER.

The Bible of to-day is the old Bible telling its own story, making its own claims, and shining in its own light. It does not claim to be infallible. It claims to be something better,—to be profitable for instruction in righteousness. The claim of infallibilty harms both man and the Scriptures. It cramps the mind, and it diverts attention from what is highest in the Bible to the things that are crude and non-essential. The Bible does not pretend to be the one and only "word of God." The writers of Scripture never use this term to describe a book or document. The "word of God" is always to them a commanding conviction. It is simply what is known and felt to be the truth. The Biblical doctrine is that the word of the Lord is unbound. The Bible does not demand that we believe it all or reject it all. This is a senseless demand that misrepresents the Bible and drives thousands away from it.

The Bible of to-day is the old Bible freed from the theosophical mists of Alexandria that long obscured its grand lessons of righteousness, and freed also from the lurid glow of Geneva that long appalled the human heart with threatenings of eternal torment. We reset the Bible in the ever widening circle of human culture, and use it still as one of the most serviceable tools of life. It is not the only source of religious instruction, but it is a prolific fountain of spiritual inspiration. The real Bible is not an intruded revelation. It is immeasurably greater,—the report of what the soul has discovered in its search for truth and duty, in its quest for God. Not the whole record nor the last discovery, but an immensely valuable religious document.

The science of geology, the higher criticism of the earth, has made the hills new. It has clothed them with new beauty, invested them with new interest, and made them the story-books of a marvellous history. So, also, the scientific study of the Bible has given us a new Bible,—new in its origin, new in its structure, new in its messages, and new in its helpfulness to man. The geolo-

gist has revealed the hills by attending to the facts in the hills themselves. He has separated the different layers of rocks, and told us the story of each. He has interpreted the fossils, and made the ancient creatures live again. He has shown how the ice-sheet sculptured the landscape. All this he has found in the hills by studying them carefully and wisely.

The student of Scripture has renewed the Bible by the same method of study. He has given us a new Bible by paying attention to the facts in the Bible. He has separated its documents into their different literary strata, showing us when and how each was produced, and describing when and how they were interwoven and finally completed. We find that what we had supposed was the work of one author is a composite structure, slowly built up by a nation's life rather than struck off at a sitting, all the more valuable and interesting because of this origin.

And what a new Bible it is! We can see it grow. We can feel the pulsing of its throbbing life. We can place its various parts in their historical relations and understand the whole as never before. Old customs and phrases take on new meaning and beauty. Everything falls into its appropriate historic perspective. Here, again, we travel in the footsteps of the geologist. When the scientist unearths the skeleton of an old saurian, he does not flee from its fright; nor does he try to harnesss and use the old reptilian. It is dead. He lays it away reverently in the museum of antiquities. Likewise, when we read in the Bible, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," we realize that we are dealing with a dead custom. We do not obey it; we do not scoff at it. We lay it away with the old saurian in the museum of antiquitites. When we apply the historic perspective, we are able to appreciate a David without being soiled by his sins. We honor him as a hero in his age, we do not emulate him as an example in all respects for our age. In this way the new scholarship enables us to study ancient characters with pleasure and profit, without any danger of being corrupted by their errors.

Great relief and rejoicing are brought to us in another way by their discoveries. We learn that, when the Biblical writer used the statement, "God commanded me," he had in mind not a strange and supernatural, but a common and natural experience. It was the Hebrew way of saying, "I am convinced." He meant no more than when we say, "I feel that it is my duty," as the Roman meant

no more when he said, "Jupiter thunders" than when we say, " It thunders." The thought is identical, or rather the fact thought about is the same; but the mode of expression is different. We can hardly describe how great the help is, especially to children, that comes from this new understanding of Biblical language. The chasm that once seemed to separate the present from ancient times disappears. The feeling that the Biblical writers lived in a distant world and had a unique experience, wholly unlike ours, vanishes. We realize that the web of history is continuous. While their phrases were different, they wrote about matters common to us all. How much nearer this brings them! How much clearer and more helpful their message! How much easier it is for us to understand them! How the fact protects us from mistakes and superstitions!

The recent discoveries of Biblical science emancipate the Bible from innumerable misunderstanding and misuses. We realize to-day that the Bible is not responsible for the creeds long taught in its name. And this is great gain. Wherever we go, we find people who hate the Bible; but a little investigation shows us that they hate it for what has been attributed to it, and not for what it contains. The Bible is not responsible for a million crimes committed in its name, nor for a thousand dogmas falsely presented as statements of its teaching. When a man who says, "I hate the Bible," is asked why he hates it, it is almost always found that his hatred is based not upon anything in the Bible, but upon articles in the Confession which misrepresent the Bible. It is a surprising fact that among the many Scripture references that are quoted in the Westminster Confession in support of its propositions not one is taken from the ethical sayings of the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Moody was fond of saying, "Cut out of the Bible its blood passages, and everything precious in Scripture would be destroyed." Hardly a greater misrepresentation of the Bible could be invented. Nothing left? The Ten Commandments, the Psalms of loving-kindness, the great prophetic passages in the Old Testament, would remain untouched; in the New Testament, the Sermon and Parables of Jesus, the Epistle of James, Paul's chapter on "Love," and other similar passages, all that really feed the soul. Not *blood*, but *righteousness*, is the great word of the Old Testament: not *belief*, but *love*, is the great word of the New Testament. Moreover, all the highest and

noblest teachings of the Bible forcibly condemn bloody sacrifices of every form. So that we may say that the Bible in the twentieth century will no longer be held responsible for this theology of blood. It is not there. This discovery means a great triumph for spiritual religion. It means also a more ethical use of Scripture.

Sometimes we hear the doleful cry: "We have lost the dear old Bible. The critics have torn it to pieces." But is this really true? No, it is not true. What has happened is this: some old and harmful uses of the Bible have come to an end. And is it not a good thing that the Bible is not used as it once was? We can remember when the chief use of the Bible was to hurl its texts at every scientist who came from his investigations with the discovery of a great truth and at every critic who had something new to tell of the origin of the Pentateuch or the Gospels. It is good fortune for both humanity and Scripture that this irreligious use of texts has stopped. If we open a volume of the sermons of Jonathan Edwards, and note how he raked into his pages every phrase alluding to wrath and torment and magnified them, but neglected the more numerous declarations of love and hope, giving an absolutely false impression of Biblical teaching,—when we realize that his horrible tale of doom is not a true report of Hebrew prophecy or Christian gospel, we may well rejoice that we have lost some old uses of the Bible.

The new and higher uses of the Bible are well illustrated by the changed attitude toward the little writing known as the book of Jonah. Formerly, when we mentioned this work in a company of intelligent people, a derisive smile would sweep over their faces; for they all had in mind only that part of it that related to the absurd fish story. If we look into the old commentaries, theologies, dictionaries, and review articles, we will find that very little attention is paid to anything but this stupendous miracle. Every effort is made to make the account seem credible as reliable history. No attention is given to anything else in the prophecy. But, in this way, the real lesson of the writing is missed, and a needless burden is placed upon the human mind. Moreover, by forcing this literal interpretation, people are forced away from the Bible.

Just here the new scholarship steps in and helps us to a true understanding of this parable-prophecy, and enables us to appreciate it as one of the most beautiful and

most valuable pieces of literature in the whole world. We find in it a remarkable plea for the universality of God's love. The great doctrine is here stated that repentance and righteousness are all that man needs and all that God demands. These sentences are all aglow with the noblest sentiments of pity, compassion, and tenderness. It is an illuminated lesson in forgiveness, human and divine. It is the gospel of the supremacy of kindness. It is the most evangelical page in the Old Testament, reaching the level of anything taught by Jesus. The fish story is only a part of the poetic machinery of the parable, in itself a work of high art, conveying a great ethical truth. The writer never supposed for a moment that we would be such consummate fools as to take it literally. As absurd to take it literally as to take Emerson literally when he wrote, "Hitch your wagon to a star," and then go out and try to put a kite-string over Sirius.

In this and many similar ways the new Biblical science rescues the Bible from neglect and from misunderstanding. Those long alienated from it are brought back to a great enjoyment of it, while those who have handled it superstitiously are taught how to use it spiritually. By this new method of study, children and young people can easily be made to find in its pages both profit and pleasure.

There are those who do not see this, and they tell us that the Higher Criticism has brought a great calamity to religion. In their despair they declare, "The Bible as a supernatural standard in morals and religion has been destroyed." But this is the mournful cry of those who have never found the divinity of nature. We manage to get along without a supernatural multiplication-table. The natural truths of mathematics suffice for the engineer and architect in building bridge and rearing dome. Though only natural, may not Biblical pleas for righteousness and love be adequate for the building of the noblest human character? What authority could a miracle add to the Beatitudes? No moral chaos will follow the discovery that the Bible was naturally evolved. When we discover that love is not divine because commanded in Scripture, we see the larger truth that it is divine because in nature, and it is commanded in Scripture because an essential constituent of the Cosmos. And what does this do for us? It broadens and deepens the basis of morality. It centres the whole weight of the universe upon these moral principles. It invests the Bible with new attractiveness and a more spiritual authority. And children trained to

read the Bible in this spirit will never have their moral life put in jeopardy by discovering that texts are not all that they once supposed them to be.

We, therefore, leave the Bible as a prison, where thought was kept in chains, and sentiment was made as a slave; but we re-enter it by the gateway of rational appreciation, and find it a rich and beautiful pasture land of the soul. Into it children should be turned with freedom, like cattle into a clover field. We will not compel them to eat everything, and we will not fear that harm will come from incidental errors. We escape from the Bible as a lumber-room where men gather only dead material for deadening dogmas. We go back to it as a garden of the Lord, where the trees of life still grow. We no longer clutch at its texts and use them as clubs to beat doubters and sceptics; instead we pile them as fuel on the altar-fires of the heart, to feed the smokeless flame of love that casts no shadow.

We stand on the threshold of a great organization of religious thought and life. This new view of the Bible is essential to a right solution of these problems. The old theology was a radical misunderstanding of Scripture. The new gospel must lay hold of these great discoveries respecting the Bible. The first thing that a man needs to do to-day is to reconstruct his views and uses of these Biblical writings. But more than this is needed. It is not enough to put aside false views of the Bible. Here is where many who call themselves liberal make a great mistake. How many imagine, "I have shed the old superstitions: this is enough." The deeper question is, Have you laid hold of its spirituality? It is not enough to discover that it does not teach Calvinism. We must incorporate its important lessons and eternal truths into our own lives. We have not done our duty when we stop the old false uses of texts. The greater task remains,—the higher uses that make for righteousness.

We often hear it said that the Bible is not revelation, but simply literature. It is not enough merely to say this. The Bible is literature; but it is also more than literature, as the little worn shoe of the vanished baby which the mother treasures as so precious is more than a piece of leather. The Bible has been enriched by the associations of centuries. The spirituality of millions of lives has flowed into it, and made it a wonderful and powerful human magnet. The Biblical page is something more than it was when it fell from the hand of the prophet.

It was then literature: it is now literature *plus* all this acquired sanctity and association. And it is just this, as well as the essential message of the Bible, which the parent and the Sunday-school teacher must seek with great skill and tact to impart.

Sometimes we hear it said, The critics have destroyed my mother's Bible. But is this really true? Let us see. If you are so fortunate as to have that precious volume,—a mother's Bible,—take it into your hands and look at it carefully. What do you find? You will see that the marks of use lie along the edge where the Psalms and Proverbs and Prophecies come. Open it, and how easily the pages turn where the Gospels are! The passages worn by finger-marks and blurred by tears are the early chapters of Matthew and the spiritual chapters of Paul in Romans and Corinthians. Here is the eternal Bible that will never die. It fed the mother's heart: it is still the bread of life to our hearts. Criticism has not destroyed these pages that were so dear to her. Our theories about the Bible may differ from hers; but the hope and love and comfort that she found are all there for us, if we will but lay hold of them. Indeed, the Bible, in the hands of the modern student, has all the spirituality that she found in it; and in addition has meanings that she did not understand. There is gain, not loss, if we bring to it a soul like hers, athirst for the living God.

Finally, the supreme truth to keep before us and place before young people is this: a group of writings that came out of the cross-fertilization of the world's greatest races, that contain the experiences of a people with a remarkable genius for religion, that convey the story and spirit of our noblest prophet, that have been enriched by the associations of many centuries, and that have been intimately inwoven in all the productions of poet, painter, and musician, being the inspiration of all the arts as well as guide and teacher to jurist and statesman,—here surely is a human document too precious to be neglected and too helpful to be misused.

THE IDEAL TEACHER.

BY REV. ADELBERT L. HUDSON.

I am glad to speak at this meeting, partly because the Sunday-school seems to me to be at once the most important and the most neglected department of our work, partly because the Sunday-school meeting at our National Conference always calls out a selected audience. [Laughter.]

I am glad also to speak upon the subject assigned; for I believe that in the evolution of the ideal teacher lies the great secret of our success. One often hears certain ministers spoken of as especially successful in their work in the Sunday-school; but every minister knows that, if any progress has been made by the Sunday-school connected with his church, it has been because he has had the good fortune to secure the services of a corps of faithful and efficient teachers. What, then, are the requirements of the teacher?

In the first place the ideal teacher should have the primary characteristic of creation: "Male and Female created he them." [Laughter and applause.] At the Alliance meeting yesterday a delegate from Kentucky complained that too much of the work of our churches is left for women to do. The charge is unfortunately too well sustained, and it applies with especial force to the Sunday-school. I do not undervalue the splendid work done in this field by girls and women; but, if we would achieve the best results, we must have the co-operation of active, busy, practical men. The average boy of fifteen is a good test of the efficiency of your work, and you may be pretty sure that he will not remain long in any school which cannot command the services of manly men.

Again, the ideal teacher must not be too pious. Many a business man, who would make an excellent teacher, excuses himself on the ground that he is not religious enough, when the thing he has in mind is not religion at all, but "piosity." He is neither irreligious nor unreligious, but he has a wholesome contempt for hypocrisy and cant. Such a man, earnest and practical, alert and up-to-date, is just what is needed to measure up to the require-

ments of the average boy or girl. The most mischievous boy, bubbling over with animal spirits, has nevertheless long, deep, earnest thoughts which no one knows and few suspect. But he is distrustful of outward expressions of moral purpose. Whoever would teach him must comprehend his nature and be capable of sympathy with his point of view. The ideal teacher will not undertake to translate the native vigor of youth into pious platitudes or canting commonplaces.

The ideal teacher must be at the same time something of a pastor. The indifference of Unitarian parents to the religious education of their children, alluded to by Dr. Savage yesterday in his appeal for Hackley Hall, cannot be overcome by preaching alone. The inertia is too ponderous. The teacher must visit the home and take with her all of her persuasiveness and tact, must first win the interest of the child and then the co-operation of the parent, thus securing by personality what should come from conviction. Any good teacher can fill his or her class to the full limit of convenient leadership by judicious visiting.

Above all, the ideal teacher will really teach something. Personality is important, but it cannot take the place of instruction. The Sunday-school should afford liberal opportunity for practical instruction in ethics and a rational study of the Bible. I would especially emphasize the latter. Outside of the theological seminaries the Sunday-school is about the only place where any systematic reading or study of the Bible can be found. It no longer enters into school training or home life. The "family altar" has become a fading memory. Only in story does "the sire turn o'er wi' patriarchal grace the big ha' Bible, once his father's pride." But for the work of the Sunday-school the coming generation would know the Old and New Testaments only through quotations and literary references which it would hardly be able to understand. Mrs. Beatley has spoken of the need of an abridged Bible; but for the present the teacher must make his own abridgment, must make its pages glow with interest, while its great historic characters live and move and breathe in an atmosphere made real by the teacher's ardor.

THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE.

The session of the Conference on Tuesday afternoon, September 24, was devoted to the biennial meeting of the National Alliance. Although the attendance was smaller than in 1899, the meeting was of more than usual interest from the presence of representatives from many different parts of the country. Four vice-presidents and eleven directors were present, and credentials were presented from seventeen states and Canada.

The meeting was presided over by the New England vice-president, Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells, who in her address of welcome expressed the universal feeling of regret at the absence of the president, detained at home by illness. For ten years Mrs. Dix has been the devoted and self-sacrificing leader of the Alliance, and for the first time was absent from the biennial meeting.

The report of the recording secretary noted the changes in the board of officers and the increase in numbers, there being now seven vice-presidents and thirty-one directors. The report of the corresponding secretary showed the increase in the number of branches to be large, especially in the West. There are now two hundred and seventy-six Branches, and an Alliance membership of nearly twelve thousand women. The amount of money raised during the last year was $77,186.99. In addition to this sum the Branches in the Pacific Coast Conference raised $7,374.14. $2,639.94 have been sent to the central treasury for the running expenses of the national board.

The most important business of the meeting was the unanimous adoption of amended by-laws, several changes being necessary to enable the Alliance to become incorporated. The most radical change in the new by-law is the holding of an annual instead of a biennial meeting, as heretofore, and the annual election of officers. Consequently, the following vice-presidents and directors were elected to serve until next May only, at which time the first annual meeting will occur.

For vice-presidents.—New England, Kate Gannett Wells; Middle States, Emma C. Low; Southern States, Antoinette Danforth Smith; Central States, Fanny Field; Middle West, Mary W. McKittrick; Rocky Mountains,

Rebecca P. Utter; Pacific Coast, Edith K. Davis. *For directors.*—Maine, Sarah Fairfield Hamilton; New Hampshire, Mary A. Downing, Annabel Warren; Vermont, Mary C. Warder; Massachusetts, Elizabeth P. Channing, Sarah E. Hooper, Sarah C. F. Wellington, Abby A. Peterson, Phebe M. Waldo, Abby L. Stone, Emma S. Phalen, Sarah B. Williams, Eliza R. Sumner, Isabel S. Clark, Lucy Lewis; Rhode Island, Mary E. Cleveland; New York, Minnie H. Bishoprick, Mary Seward Merrell, Sarah A. Kenny; Canada, S. Margaret Loud; New Jersey, Elizabeth N. Bell; Pennsylvania, Anna H. Howell; Ohio, Alice D. Bradley; Illinois, Ellen F. Marshall; Missouri, Belle M. Page; Michigan, Ida A. Marks; Wisconsin, Mary G. Upham; Colorado, Perlina S. Davis; Nebraska, Amelia S. Marsh; California, Elizabeth B. Easton, Carolyn Wattles.

Following the business, a series of ten-minute addresses were given on "The Present Work of the Alliance." These addresses were written by Mrs. William L. Voigt of Montreal, Mrs. A. B. Robinson of New York, Mrs. Arthur Bradley of Cleveland, Mrs. C. F. Smith of Louisville, and Mrs. G. W. Stone of San Francisco, and with two exceptions were read by the writers. The concluding paper was a most able presentation of "The Opening Opportunities of the Alliance," by Mrs. E. H. Atherton of Roxbury, Mass. The insight into present conditions and the possibilities of the future presented in these six papers were interesting, instructive, and inspiring.

A telegram of greeting was received from the Executive Board of the Women's Unitarian Conference of the Pacific Coast, and the meeting closed with an uplifting benediction from Rev. Anna Garlin Spencer.

Immediately after the meeting the officers of the Alliance held a reception in the large parlor of the United States Hotel, at which all attending the Conference were most cordially welcomed. These receptions have become a regular feature of Conference work, and afford a most delightful opportunity for friendly greeting, reunion of friends, and *real* conference.

UNITARIAN CHURCH TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

The Unitarian Church Temperance Society held its meeting on Thursday afternoon, September 26, in the Broadway Theatre, Saratoga.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Richard C. Humphreys of Boston, Mass., who said:—

If this is not the largest meeting of the week, it is certainly the most select, and I believe it to be one of the most important. I regret exceedingly the absence of our dear friend, Rev. Charles F. Dole, the president, making it incumbent upon me to preside this afternoon. As I look at this audience, I look back fifty-five years when I attended meetings often called in the interest of the anti-slavery cause. The abolitionists held meetings just about such as these. They had very select audiences. Thirty or forty years after that time I could hardly find a minister or a prominent layman that was not, in his own opinion, an abolitionist thirty or forty years before. I believe that that will be the case with this cause of temperance. I believe the time will come when a great many who are not now in it will join this movement, and many will think that they were strong temperance people and did all they could to advance the cause.

Why do we need the Unitarian Church Temperance Society? We want it first because we want to interest the ministers more than they are interested in the cause of temperance. I will allow for this beautiful day and for the fact that many have returned to their homes; but we all know that there is not so great an interest in the cause of temperance as we feel that there should be among the ministers. I believe, if all ministers were really interested in the cause of temperance, the question would be practically settled. Look at the indifference which exists on this subject. A minister calls at the house of one of his parishioners. They have a pleasant evening. Toward its close they bring out cigars and beer and crackers and cheese, and they have a pleasant time. The minister thinks because he only took a glass of mild wine or a couple of glasses of beer that he was acting the part of a temperance man. The next day, the parishioner, who is a young man, says: "The parson was around to the house last

night. We brought out beer and cigars, and we had a jolly time." That minister, I say, has lost his influence in the cause of temperance. If the moral and Christian portion of our community were really interested in this question and did all they could for its advancement, we should very soon see a change for the better. I believe, friends, that we have been placed in this world by a loving heavenly Father to do a certain work and to fill a certain position. That work will not be done unless we do it. We are God's instruments. Our work is to uplift humanity, to draw the world nearer to God. And I do not know of any better way of uplifting humanity than by advancing the cause of temperance. What we need, then, on the part of ministers and laymen, is a willingness to sacrifice something. "If eating meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no more meat while the world standeth." If taking wine and beer make my brother to offend, I will drink no more wine or beer. What we need is that spirit of self-sacrifice which leads us to give ourselves for the sake of the cause, for in this work the gift without the giver is bare.

Let us not be discouraged because there are few workers in the field but, in the spirit of the sermon we heard by Mr. St. John, feel all the more reason for buckling on the armor or bearing our cross if it must be, trusting in God and working for humanity. We cannot be successful in this work unless we realize its magnitude and the difficulties we are to overcome. No great or good work was ever accomplished in this world without effort. Think of the magnificent bridge which connects the city of Brooklyn with New York. Was it built without peril or labor? The weaving of that aerial span and the building of those massive towers of masonry were not accomplished without discouragements that seemed at times almost insurmountable. But those who undertook that work accomplished by a vast amount of effort a task which will compare favorably with the Colossus of Rhodes or the Pyramids of Egypt. I believe we can never accomplish this work until we are determined to do it, until we look not at the magnitude of the task, but at the grandeur of the result. We cannot do this work until the prayer of our hearts is that expressed in the hymn,—

"Father, hear the prayer we offer,
Not for ease that prayer shall be,
But for strength that we may ever
Live our lives courageously."

"WHAT MIGHT HAVE SAVED JAMIE?"

BY REV. WILLIAM C. GANNETT.

This subject always sobers me, almost silences one; but it helps a little to make it concrete. "I love whiskey better than my mother." The poor fellow who said the words sat in my room a cold winter's day in St. Paul, a wreck of a man, his very face showing that he had been brought into the world in a wrong way and had been brought up in the world in a wrong way; and the summing up of his life,—and it might well have been called his epitaph, for he was really dead for the world, although he lived years after,—the summing up was, as with bowed head he said, "I love whiskey better than my mother." There was nothing very unusual in the case except this,—that that man was of Unitarian birth, brought up in a Unitarian home, and had probably inherited or caught his habit of drink from Unitarian surroundings. There he was, a young fellow, perhaps thirty-five. His father had died. He evidently had drifted out into the world away from his home. He had been helped again and again to his feet by one friend or another of the old home, but here he was almost literally a son of the gutter. Somewhere out in the world there sat a woman with an aching heart,—that one he contrasted with his whiskey as the one he loved less than it. Somewhere in the land she still was sitting in the chamber thinking of this wayward son, now and then remitting to him a little money when she found out where he was last; so that he was thinking of a living mother when he made that confession and summed up his life to date: "I love whiskey better than my mother." What might have saved that man from being the derelict that he was? Let us call his name Jamie. No doubt *she* thought of him by his boy-name.

What might have saved Jamie? That is the question which arises again and again when you meet these specific cases; when you do not know for the life of you what will save a man now; when you cannot tell what to do; when, for all you can see, those who have to do something are doing all that he or she can do; when, I say, you can give no answer to the question What can I do *now?* the question comes back, "What *might* I have done to save Jamie?"

In this concrete form it is well, I think, to face the problems of intemperance: What might have saved Jamie? Think over the agencies that the country and the age in which he is living have organized around him to save him. Suppose I ask the general public, the people, what they have done to save Jamie, they would answer: "We have opened a public school; and in that school we compel the teaching of so much physiology, a large part of the physiology being given to the influence of alcohol upon the tissues of Jamie's body. We have pictured it, we have anecdoted it, we have charted it, we have lectured it. We have compelled him to listen. We have taught him that alcohol *per se* is a poison. We have done all we could in this way for that public school boy. That is one thing we have done." I do not doubt that so they save some.

But not Jamie. Well, if we have not saved Jamie in that way, we have, at least, limited his field of temptation. Instead of allowing a saloon on every corner, we have set a limit upon the saloon, so that he only encounters the temptation at each third or fourth corner in the city. We have regulated his temptation in certain other ways, too; for after a certain hour he would find it difficult to get anything to drink. Yes, we have done something to limit temptation. We have not tried to blot out the temptation from the city, because we think we cannot, or think we have not a right to do that; and besides, inasmuch as the temptation costs the city a great deal, we want to make it pay its part, and we collect several thousand dollars a year from it. That is another thing, we the people, have done.

Then we do a third thing. Under certain circumstances, if Jamie becomes an offence to the public; if he gets in the way of us, the public, and becomes a nuisance to the city,—then we will take Jamie and shut him up behind bars; and, if he has done anything really dangerous, we will shut him up long enough to clean not only the outside of the body, but to clean the inside, and get the poison out of his blood, and to send him out with a clean face and fresh courage and new hope. We, the public, are not going to take charge of him beyond the prison doors. We do not take and pull him through the temptation, and shield him from that; but we will start him clear-blooded in the world again.—All this is true; and yet the fact is that there is Jamie unsaved and going to the bad, and the sad women sitting there and talking it over with their minister friends, and perhaps the old Puritan in them

says: "He *knows* better. He *wants* to do better. Why *can't* he do better? No power on earth would make *me* do the wrong, if I felt I must not. Why can't he feel that power?" Why *can't* he? That is just the heart of the question. The public says, "I cannot answer that question"; and the public cannot.

The public having exhausted its means of saving Jamie, let us look around and see what other agencies there are that might help him. There is his home. I think, so far as the woman part of his home is concerned, it often does miracles to help save him,—everything that devoted love can do. That is so often the case, the love being sometimes incarnated in mother, sometimes in wife, sometimes in sister. But this particular Jamie might have said:—"My father gave me poison in my will, making it weak from my birth." They would often have a right to say that. The home surely has far greater opportunities of saving its boys than the public has of saving its citizens. I will not say that *everything* depends upon the home; but so much more depends upon the home than we realize till we have lost a Jamie from our home, that I wonder with all my powers of wonder how a man can be a father, how a woman can be a mother, without bending all their mother and father natures to put the shields around their boy before he gets out into the broad world. That Unitarian derelict, wandering dangerous over the seas, that boy had simply followed this rule: "I take what Father does." On the table had been day by day the beer or wine. On the sideboard had been week after week and year after year the brandy or the whiskey; and the boy had simply followed the son's rule,—"I take what Father takes." Here was the end, the result of the rule: "I love whiskey better than my mother." Within a weak will it had worked out like an arithmetical problem. Here sat the answer. The home has so much to do in saving the Jamies that I do not see how a father who loves his boy,and knows the relation of his boy to example and to temptation, can allow the wine cup on the table, or how the mother can; or how any reasoning about internal self-control and the way to meet temptation being to accustom one's self to the temptation,—I do not see how any thought of that kind can weigh with a father and win a mother to keep the decanter on the sideboard and the wine on the table. When they have had their actual Jamie become the possible Jamie,—my God, I pity the prayers of their broken hearts: "Oh, if I had done otherwise *then* in his young days!"

Well, the public and the home, neither of them is saving Jamie! Is there any other agency on earth that can save them? I remember asking Superintendent Brockway one day, "Do you have any men here for whom you feel in your heart that reform is impossible?" His answer was, "Yes, in *one* life." That friend of mine in St. Paul, the man who loved whiskey better than his mother,—I presume it would be impossible to save that man in *one* life. Happy those who have firm faith that he will have more lives than one for his saving!

Is there any possible influence besides public and home? Yes, there are the Friends, you and I. Friends can have a great deal of influence, and save a great many Jamies.

Here we are, come together as friends of the derelicts, friends of our own boys, and of possible Jamies. What can we do? Why, a friend, and, still more, three good, strong-hearted, strong-principled friends, can do ever so much to save Jamie, if they get hold of him early enough and love him enough. Three strong friends, feeling deeply and planning for the complete avoidance of the temptation, the complete non-use of liquor, can go through the world as his body-guard. Even when absent, they are with him. "John would not have me do this. Henry would not have me do this. I want to meet them the next time I see them with the same clear eye in which I left them." Three or four girls may save, and have saved, many a Jamie, the thought of them being as sheltering angels. This friend-side we have to think of in gatherings like this; though it makes one ache to have to answer the question, What might save Jamie? by simply repeating, "More of the same, more of the same friendship." I do not see how any new method can be invented. It is all very well to go to the alcohol cure: that helps some. But there is no new patent way; it is the old friendship way of saving we must follow.

Was it not inspiring last night to listen to that noble-faced woman, Jane Addams of Hull House, Chicago, so simple in tone, so simple in story, telling of one of the beautiful deeds of the world done during the last ten years, as if she were telling the story of something that had been done around the corner as she passed by? Was it not instructive and interesting to listen to her decision that there was not very much to be said about it, that it was not big work, that it was just common little work, that it would not do a great deal of good, anyway, but still it was a thing to be done, and would go on, and that

Hull House would not leave that slum district of Chicago, though everybody else left it,—was it not inspiring to hear her tell her story in that way? I fancy, friends, the one thing that can save Jamie is to have the Hull House spirit in the world. You know the motto of our society is, "For their sake." I wish some woman heart, some Jesus heart, with a knack of wording motives graciously, would take that motto of ours, and transfigure it into something that would not sound quite so much like the tone of a saved person speaking to one who was not yet saved. "For their sake." I know the intent and meaning of that motto is all right, but I can imagine some of the persons who need that motto not liking the sound of it. The heart of the motto was told by Jane Addams. What was the bridge between her and the families about her? Only *imaginative sympathy*. She had travelled over that bridge of her sympathy, and imaginatively set herself down five blocks away; and then she travelled five blocks further away into the slum, and there she planted the actual Hull House. Suppose that spirit were multiplied over the earth,—in your town, in the great centres of population; suppose there were a great flood of the Jane Addams spirit; suppose these bridges of imaginative sympathy, call them if you will, "For-their-sake-bridges,"—suppose they were to spring in all directions, from me to you, from me to him, from all of us to the Jamies out in the world,—would not there be a great many of them saved? Would not the answer to my aching question, What might have saved Jamie be found?

There is the saloon. We want to do justice to its keeper. It gave me a strange shock of dismay once in my own home to hear Jane Addams refer to one of the saloon-keepers right around Hull House as "my friend." I had thought of the saloon-keeper as the man tempting the Jamies. She had lived among them, had gotten on the inside of them. "You cannot hate a man after you know him; and, if you do not know him, it is your own fault." So she told us; and therefore she knew that there was a good deal of use and a good deal of health in those saloon-keepers.

Yes, if somebody would only *angel* the words, "For their sake," so that we might feel the depth of sympathy in them, and so that, while doing justice to the saloon-keeper, we should yet rise and form our habits and frame our words and organize our deeds into sympathy with the victims of "my friend, the saloon-keeper,"—that would do

the work of saving Jamie; and I rather think nothing else will. Do justice to the saloon-keepers, and at the same time let us side with their victims every time,—side with their victims as against them, and with their victims as against the fathers and mothers and ministers who are indifferent to Jamie's temptations. How can ministers,—to echo the words of your chairman,—ministers counting the wrecks in their parish, sitting down with the mothers in their tears, planning with the fathers for rescue, seeing the young men and, oh pity, sometimes the women, of their parish go down, with drink,—how can the *ministers* do aught but give up all connection whatever with the great-victim making power of this twentieth century? For, when we count up all the other victim-making agencies, there is no victim factory so great, no power organized in a victim factory so strong, as this that we call the drink power. "For their sake,"—let us all say it, each not as one who is superior to one who is inferior, but as one who means to plant himself by the side of Jamie, first, last, and forever.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

BY REV. WILLIAM L. WALSH.

Intemperance seems to us to be so positively an evil, the results are so apparent, it has so hindered Christianity, Unitarinism and every other system having the welfare of humanity at heart, that universal interest and opposition seems the only attitude. My purpose to-day is to speak concretely of this evil, and I take as an example the parable of the Prodigal Son.

So far from being black at heart, as so many have painted him, this young man may merely have been seeking opportunities of "life, liberty and happiness," impossible in the home of his childhood. This going away from home has become almost universal in our time. The visions of wealth and power and position that lead to it are not necessarily misleading, nor the ambitions unrighteous. Out of them have come to us the achievements of mind and heart.

In the story the young man's venture is a failure. And his is the life-story of great numbers gathered from both sexes and all classes. What is the secret of this wholesale failure? My own opinion is that the individual alone is not to be held responsible; that the responsibility is shared by Christianity, by the government. What are the government and Christianity itself for. The answer is contained in the Declaration of Independence,—the securing of individual rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To do this, each must help the other. The universal law of society is interdependence of relationship. No man can live unto himself alone.

This going away from home is attended by the greatest dangers. The restraints of home life, of family ties, of local associations and fellowships, are removed. There is the desire to do in Rome as Rome does, and the universal hungering for social enjoyment and companionship. Temptations lie in wait. Sometimes the consequences of a certain course, good or bad, are easily discernible. Not so with the drink habit. The result here is different from the promise. He who journeys into a far country may be weak from inherited tendencies. Thus it is not

with odds in his favor, nor even equal, that he enters the list, unless government and Christianity keep faith with him.

The judgment passed on the vast army of young people who enter on a career away from home and meet with failure through drunkenness is that they were bad from the beginning. Not so. They were seeking life. The prize was liberty and the means of power.

We are wont to say that all who will may be employed. But many lose their positions and—because of the bleared eye, the trembling hand, the clouded brain—are unable to use the skill that nature has given them. These, too, are said to be times of over production. I am no industrial economist, but sure that the real trouble very largely is that things are not distributed. The necessities of life are not supplied. So long as there is a legitimate want ungratified, there cannot be overproduction. It simply means that there is no money to buy, and in many cases there is no money simply because it has been expended for the gratification of an appetite that grows with the supply. The value received for the expended wages is a waste. The liberty that leaves out of the account the advantages to be gained through the exercise of the physical and mental powers is not liberty. Then the liberty of moral power must be included. The slave to drink is a slave to every possibility of evil within him.

Herbert Spencer says that happiness is the highest good. It certainly is the universal desire. Young people going into the far country have its attainment at heart. How often has its promise been proved to be false! Yet our faith in Christianity, in the government of America, convinces us that there is power to make this promise good. This faith is based upon friendship. "I had a friend," is the secret of many a success in life. "I had no friend," is the secret of all failure. A friend remembers us when we have forgotten ourselves. He holds us up to our best. The young man came to the husks and the swine in the far country because he found no friend there. Mutual helpfulness is the law of life. Through one means and another the classes that ought to have come together have been kept apart. It is a well-known saying that a churchman will live next door to a man for years without knowing his name, while the frequenters of a saloon will gain his confidence and know all about him in twenty-four hours.

I have spoken of strangers. There should be no

strangers. There should be no far country. Church and State should unite in care for their own. The individual will play an important part,—most important when guided by those who have already won success and been themselves helped by a wise choice. One solution of the temperance problem is the co-operation of communities, churches, homes, those who believe in the Christianity of Channing and Parker and Hale, in a personal, familiar, protecting friendship.

LIST OF DELEGATES

ELECTED TO ATTEND THE NINETEENTH MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, TO BE HELD IN SARATOGA, SEPT. 23–26, 1901.

NOTE.—The asterisk appears only before the names of those persons who did *not* hand in their delegate tickets at Saratoga.

CALIFORNIA.

BERKELEY—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. Frederick L. Hosmer, *Mrs. Harriet Kelsey Fay, *Mrs. Edmund S. Gray.
LOS ANGELES—Church of the Unity: *Rev. Charles J. K. Jones, *Miss M. M. Fetta, Mrs. W. D. Campbell.

CANADA.

MONTREAL—Church of the Messiah: Mrs. John Loud, Mrs. William S. Barnes.
OTTAWA—Church of Our Father: Rev. Albert Walkley, *Charles E. Russell, *Andrew Halkett.
TORONTO—First Unitarian Church: Rev. J. T. Sunderland.

COLORADO.

DENVER—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. David Utter, Mrs. Louise de Lasseville.

DELAWARE.

WILMINGTON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. A. T. Bowser, *Mrs. Frances S. Garrett, *Mrs. Mary R. Bancroft. Alternates: Mrs. A. D. Warner, Miss Helen S. Garrett.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON—All Souls' Church: Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, Miss Emily J. Brigham.

ILLINOIS.

CHICAGO—Unity Church: Rev. Albert Lazenby, Hon. George E. Adams.
SHEFFIELD—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Seward Baker.

IOWA.

DAVENPORT—First Unitarian Church (First Unitarian Society); *Rev. Arthur M. Judy, *Miss Ellen M. Gould, *H. H. Hills. Alternate: *Mrs. H. H. Hills.

KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE—Church of the Messiah: Rev. Fred V. Hawley, Mrs. Charles F. Smith.

MAINE.

AUGUSTA—Unitarian Society: *Rev. Elmer E. Newbert, *Gen. Selden Connor, *Leslie C. Cornish, Esq.
BANGOR—Independent Congregational Society: Mrs. Harriet S. Griswold, Mrs. Robert W. Sawyer.
CASTINE—First Congregational Society (Unitarian): Rev. Henry H. Woude, Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Carpenter.
PORTLAND—First Parish: Rev. John C. Perkins, Mrs. Jno. C. Perkins, Miss Elizabeth W. Varnum.
SACO—Second Parish: Rev. W. F. Skerrye, Mrs. Charlotte Fales, Mrs. B. F. Hamilton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE—First Independent Christ's Church: *Rev. William B. Geoghegan, *Charles H. Torsch, Mrs. Mary N. Perry.

MASSACHUSETTS.

ARLINGTON—First Congregational Parish: Rev. Frederic Gill, *Mr. and *Mrs. H. G. Porter.
ASHBY—First Parish: *Rev. George S. Shaw, *Miss Florence R. Gates, *Miss Ethel M. Sheldon.
ATHOL—Second Unitarian Society: *Rev. John W. Barker, *Mr. and *Mrs. Eli G. Greene.
AYER—First Unitarian Parish: *Rev. John W. Roberts, *Miss Emma Butterfield, *Fred Hosmer.
BARRE—First Parish: Rev. Alvin F. Bailey, *Mr. and *Mrs. Austin F. Adams.
BELMONT—Congregational Society: Rev. Hilary Bygrave, Mrs. Amy Bygrave, Miss M. Livermore. Alternates: *Miss G. V. Chenery, *Miss C. M. Chenery.
BERLIN—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. Arthur E. Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Silas R. Carter.
BEVERLY—First Parish: Rev. B. R. Buckeley.
BILLERICA—First Parish: Rev. and Mrs. Edgar S. Wiers, *Frederic T. Clark.
BOLTON—First Parish and Religious Society: *Rev. J. N. Pardee, *Mr. and *Mrs. F. C. Edes.
BOSTON—South Congregational Church: Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D., D. B. Flint.
Arlington Street Church: *Rev. Paul Frothingham, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Pickering, Mrs. E. L. Little.
Bulfinch Place Church: Rev. Christopher R. Eliot, Mrs. William Howell Reed.
Church of the Disciples: Chas. G. Ames, *Prof. Frank Vogel, *Miss Annette P. Rogers, Miss Hannah Kimball, Miss Lilian Freeman Clarke.
First Church: *Rev. James Eells, Henry Endicott, *Joseph B. Moors. Alternate: *Mrs. Joseph B. Moors.
Second Church—Rev. and Mrs. Thomas Van Ness, Mrs. D. W. Ensign. *Mrs. Ellen Ireson.
(Dorchester) Christ Church: *Rev. B. A. Goodridge, Mrs. E. J. Lewis, Mrs. William A. Wood.
Third Religious Society: Rev. and Mrs. Frederick B. Mott, George Dexter.
First Parish: *Rev. Eugene R. Shippen, Mrs. Caroline A. Phipps, Mrs. Richard C. Humphreys.
(Jamaica Plain) First Congregational Society: *Rev. C. F. Dole, *Ellis Peterson, *Mrs. Bethia Curtis Reed. Alternates: Mrs. Ellis Peterson, Miss Ellen C. Morse.
(Neponset) Church of the Unity: Rev. Dr. George W. Cuter, *Mr. and *Mrs. J. W. Whitmarsh.
(Roxbury) All Souls' Unitarian Church: Rev. Henry T. Secrist, Mrs. E. A. Atherton, Mrs. Charles Newhall.
BRAINTREE—All Souls' Church: Rev. Frederick R. Griffin.
BREWSTER—First Parish: *Rev. Thomas Dawes, *Mr. and *Mrs. Joseph Henry Sears.
BRIDGEWATER—First Congregational Society: *Rev. Charles A. Allen, *Mr. and *Mrs. H. M. Blackstone.
(East Bridgewater) First Parish [Unitarian Church]; *Rev. John W. Quimby, *Mr. and *Mrs. Walter H. Adams. Alternate: *Miss Maria Nutter.

BROCKTON—Unity Church: *Rev. Rush R. Shippen, *Mrs. William H. Cary, *Mrs. D. P. Kenney.
BROOKFIELD—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. William L. Walsh, Mrs. Elizabeth M. Johnson, Mrs. George C. Converse.
BROOKLINE—First Parish: Rev. William H. Lyon, D.D., Charles H. Stearns, Miss Lucy Lowell.
Second Unitarian Society: Rev. and *Mrs. Edward D. Towle, *Mrs. J. C. Littlefield.
CAMBRIDGE—First Parish: Rev. Samuel M. Crothers, Franklin Perrin, Esq., Mrs. Franklin Perrin.
Third Congregational Society: *Rev. Augustus P. Reccord, Miss Eleanor Wheeler, Miss C. J. Southard.
CANTON—First Congregational Parish: *Rev. Henry F. Jenks, *Mr., Miss and *Mrs. George Frederick Sumner.
CHELMSFORD—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. Alfred D. K. Shurtleff, Mr. and *Mrs. George A. Parkhurst.
CHELSEA—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. Margaret B. Barnard, *Mr. and *Mrs. Price T. Edwards.
CHESTNUT HILL—Chestnut Hill Society: Miss Lucy Lowell.
CHICOPEE—First Unitarian Church: Mrs. Robert Bemis.
CLINTON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. James C. Duncan, *Judge and *Mrs. C. C. Stone.
COHASSET—First Congregational Church: Rev. Wm. R. Cole, Dr. and Mrs. Charles B. Bridgham.
CONCORD—First Parish: Rev. Loren B. Macdonald, Prescott Keyes, Mrs. James B. Wood.
DANVERS—Unitarian Congregational Society: *Rev. K. E. Evans, *Henry B. Learned, *Mrs. Mary Page. Alternate: *Miss Mary W. Nichols.
DIGHTON—Pedobaptist Congregational: Rev. A. J. Rich, Mrs. H. L. Rich, Mrs. R. F. B. Rounds.
EASTON, NORTH—Unity Church: Rev. and Mrs. William L. Chaffin, Mrs. E. W. Gilmore.
FAIRHAVEN—Washington St. Christian Church: *Rev. William Brunton, *Mr. Edmund Anthony, Jr., *Mrs. Edmund Anthony, Jr.
FALL RIVER—Unitarian Society: Rev. John M. Wilson, Mrs. E. S. Adams, E. S. Adams.
FITCHBURG—First Parish: Rev. Arthur W. Littlefield, Mrs. H. C. Hartwill, Henry A. Goodrich.
FRAMINGHAM—First Parish: Rev. Calvin Stebbins, *Samuel B. Bird, *Joseph C. Cloyes.
GARDINER—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Charles A. Place, *Mr. and *Mrs. H. H. Sawin.
GLOUCESTER—First Parish Society: *Rev. and *Mrs. Lyman M. Greenman, *F. A. Docherty.
GREENFIELD—Third Congregational Society: *Rev. John D. Reid, S. B. State, Mrs. Fayette Smith.
GROTON—First Church of Christ: *Rev. Joshua Young, Mrs. E. M. Needham, Miss Gertrude Bancroft Gerrish.
HAVERHILL—First Parish: Mrs. R. J. Lamb, D. F. G. Lamb, Mrs. Edward West.
HINGHAM—Third Congregational Society: Rev. Charles E. Park, Mrs. Louise Baldwin, *Mrs. Ira G. Hersey.
First Parish: Rev. Louis C. Cornish, *Mr. and *Mrs. Eugene F. Skinner, Francis H. Lincoln.
HOPEDALE—Hopedale Parish: Rev. Lewis G. Wilson, Mrs. F. E. Smith, Miss Grace M. Dutcher.
HOLYOKE—Liberal Christian Congregational Society: Rev. Antone G. Singsen, *Mr. and *Mrs. Robert T. Prentiss.
HUDSON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. John Baltzly, Hon. and Mrs. L. D. Apsley.
HYDE PARK—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. William H. Savage, *Mr. and *Mrs. Ferdinand A. Wyman.
KINGSTON—First Congregational Parish: *Rev. Courtland Y. De Normandie, *Joseph A. Holmes, *Walter H. Faunce.
LANCASTER—First Congregational (Unitarian Church): Rev. George M. Bartol, Mrs. Addie H. Eagle, *J. K. Burrage.
LEOMINSTER—First Congregational Society (Unitarian): Rev. Frederic J. Gauld, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander S. Paton.
LITTLETON—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. William Channing Brown, Thomas H. Elliot, Miss Henrietta A. Ewings.
LOWELL—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. Charles T. Billings, Mrs. M. A. Gould, Sumner S. Gould.
LYNN—Second Congregational Society: Rev. S. B. Stewart, Mrs. Henry F. Tapley, *Charles H. Newhall.
MARLBORO—Second Parish: *Rev. Edward F. Hayward, Mr. and Mrs. John L. Stone.

MENDON—First Parish: Rev. Napoleon S. Hoagland, Mrs. Austin A. Taft, Mrs. Albert N. Darling.
MILTON—First Congregational Parish: *Rev. Roderick Stebbins, Miss Joanna Rotch, Miss Emma E. Hicks.
NANTUCKET—Second Congregational Meeting-house Society: Rev. J. F. Meyer, *Mrs. Catherine Starbuck, Miss Gertrude King.
NATICK—Unity Church: Rev. George F. Pratt, Homer H. Fisk, Mrs. Homer H. Fisk.
NATICK, SOUTH—First Unitarian Parish: Rev. Leverett R. Daniels, Mrs. Ella Karb, Miss Ida Pfeiffin.
NEW BEDFORD—First Congregational Society: *Mrs. George Hussey.
NEWBURYPORT—First Religious Society: *Rev. Samuel C. Beane, D.D., *John F. Young, M. D., *Mrs. John F. Young, Mrs. Wm. F. Allen.
NEWTON—Channing Church: Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson, Mr. and Mrs. W. F. Hammett.
(West Newton) First Unitarian Church: *Rev. and *Mrs. J. C. Jaynes, Mrs. Lora Osgood, Geo. H. Ellis.
NORTH ANDOVER—First Unitarian Church and Society: *Rev. Charles Noyes, *Miss Sarah Kittridge. *Miss Harriet Smith.
NORTHAMPTON—Second Congregational Society: C. C. Tracy.
NORTHBORO—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. Josiah C. Kent, Dr. Henry Barnes, Miss Emma Barnes.
NORTHFIELD—First Parish· Rev. George F. Piper, *Mrs. Nellie F. Alexander, *Miss Sallie E. G. Minot.
NORTON—Congregational Parish: Rev. Francis W. Holden, *Susan Barker, *Gertrude Lynch Holden.
PEABODY—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. George S. Anderson, *Rev. J. W. Hudson, *Mr. H. F. Walker.
PEMBROKE—First Parish: *Rev. Henry A. Westall, *Joseph J. Shepard, *Miss Florina M. Collamore.
PETERSHAM—First Unitarian Congregational Church: Rev. Robert C. Douthit, Mr. and Mrs. Francis H. Lee.
PITTSFIELD—Unity Church: Rev. Nathaniel Seaver, Mrs. M. M. W. Seaver, Mrs. Henry A. Hovey.
QUINCY—First Congregational Society (Unitarian): Rev. and Mrs. Ellery Channing Butler.
RANDOLPH—The Church of the Unity: *Rev. Wm. S. Jones, *Henry A. Belcher. *Mrs. Henry A. Belcher.
ROCKLAND—Unitarian Society: Rev. Harry Lutz, *Mrs. Moses N. Arnold, *Mrs. Helen A. Gleason.
ROSLINDALE—Unitarian Church: Rev. W. H. Alexander.
ROWE—First Congregational Unitarian Church: *Rev. Walter Knight, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund C. Wilson.
ROXBURY—First Religious Society: Mr. S. Kelley.
SALEM—North Meeting House: Rev. Geo. D. Latimer. Miss Lucy Willson, Miss May Brooks.
Second Church: Rev. Alfred Manchester, Mrs. Sarah A. Manchester.
SHARON—First Congregational Society: *Rev. John C. Kimball, *Mrs. Eliza Kempton, *Mr. Horace S. Shepard.
SHERBORN—First Congregational Church (Unitarian): *Rev. Leverett R. Daniels, *Mrs. Sarah E. Sanford, *Mrs. Robert Leland. Alternate: *Mrs. Harriett J. Daniels.
SHIRLEY—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: *Rev. E. B. Fairchild, *Mr. and Mrs. Jacob P. Hazen, Rev. Albert W. Clark.
SPRINGFIELD—Third Congregational Society: Rev. Bradley Gilman, Mrs. Charlotte Warner.
STERLING—First Congregational Unitarian Society: *Rev. John N. Woodman, *Mrs. Mary Rugg, Mrs. James Buttrick, Miss Mary F. Priest.
TAUNTON—First Congregational Society: Rev. and Mrs. Alfred Rodman Hussey, Miss Sarah B. Williams.
TEMPLETON—First Parish: Rev. John M. W. Pratt, Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Lord.
TOWNSEND (WEST)—Liberal Christian Society: *Rev. George S. Shaw, *Abel G. Stearns, *Mrs. Persis L. Reed.
TYNGSBORO—First Parish: Rev. William Brown, Mrs. William Brown, Miss Ophelia S. Brown.
UPTON (WEST)—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. Carl G. Horst, *Miss Lizzie H. Ball.
UXBRIDGE—First Congregational Society: Rev. Cyrus A. Roys, Mary Cyrus A. Roys.
VINEYARD HAVEN—Unitarian Society: *Rev. Wm. A. Litchfield, *Capt. Gilbert Smith, *Mr. Henry W. Coye.
WALTHAM—First Parish: Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Soper.

WALPOLE—First Parish: *Rev. Robert W. Savage, *Joseph S. Leach, *Mrs. Annie M. Leach, Mr. Calvin G. Hartshorn.
WARE—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Hans H. Spoer, Hon. Charles E. Stevens, Ernest D. Howard.
WATERTOWN—First Parish: Rev. W. F. Greenman, *Mrs. Alice M. Silsbee, *Solon F. Whitney.
WARWICK—First Congregational Parish: *Rev. E. H. Brenan, *M. S. Sampson, *Miss Bertha Ball.
WAVERLEY—Unitarian Society: *Rev. Charles A. Allen, *Mrs. G. Fred Kendall, *Mrs. S. A. Rice.
WELLESLEY HILLS—Unitarian Society: *Rev. John Snyder, *Clarence Bunker, *Warren Savage.
WESTBORO—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. H. Sumner Mitchell, Miss Frances Harding, Mrs. W. W. Locke.
WEST BRIDGEWATER—Rev. E. B. Maglathlin, Hon. F. E. Howard, Miss Mary Whitman.
WEST ROXBURY—First Parish: Rev. John H. Applebee.
WESTON—First Parish: Rev. Charles F. Russell, Mrs. Edward Cutting, Mr. Edward Cutting.
WESTWOOD—First Parish: *Rev. George M. Bodge, Mrs. W. W. Locke, *Mrs. G. M. Bodge.
WINCHESTER—Winchester Unitarian Society: Rev. Wm. I. Lawrance.
WINCHENDON—Church of the Unity: *Rev. A. J. Culp, *Rev. J. N. Richardson, *Mrs. J. B. Marbury.
WOBURN—First Unitarian Parish: *Rev. Henry C. Parker, Capt. John P. Crane, *Mrs. J. W. Hammond.
WOLLASTON—Rev. Frank Wright Pratt.
WORCESTER—Second Parish: Mrs. Frank E. Davis, J. P. K. Otis, *Mrs. Franklin Wyman.
Church of the Unity: Rev. Frank L. Phalen, Mrs. James H. Wall, Hon. George F. Hoar.

MICHIGAN.

ANN ARBOR—First Unitarian Society: Joseph H. Crooker, D. D., *George W. Bullis, *Fred. P. Jordan.

MISSOURI.

ST. LOUIS—Church of the Messiah: Rev. John W. Day, *Edward C. Eliot, *Mrs. Mary W. McKittrick.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

CONCORD—Second Congregational Unitarian: Rev. L. H. Buckshorn, Mrs. L. H. Buckshorn, Mrs. S. Marshall.
DOVER—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. Ward R. Clarke, *Miss Henrietta Horsch, Frank F. Fernald.
EXETER—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. Mr. and *Mrs. Edward Green *Miss Alice Healy.
HAMPTON FALLS—First Congregational Society: *Rev. Samuel C. Beane, D. D., *Newell W. Healey, *Miss Helen M. Sanborn.
KEENE—Keene Congregational Society (Unitarian): Rev. Charles B. Elder, Mrs. A. L. Burt, *Mrs. Allen Giffen.
LACONIA—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Albert W. Clark.
LITTLETON—First Unitarian Church: *Gen. George T. Cruft, Mrs. Ella M. Dow.
MANCHESTER—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Charles J. Staples.
MILFORD—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. St. Ethelbert Yates, *Miss H. Elizabeth Webster, Miss E. A. Livermore.
NASHUA—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: Rev. Herbert H. Mott *Mrs. John Scott, *John F. Stark, Esq.
WALPOLE—Town Congregational Society: Rev. Russell N. Bellows.
WILTON—Liberal Christian Church: *Rev. William F. Furman, Mrs. P. F. Amidon, *Isaac S. Whiting.

NEW JERSEY.

ORANGE—First Unitarian Church of Essex Co.; *Rev. Walter R. Hunt, *Mrs. Everett Yeaw, *Mrs. W. H. Aborn.
PLAINFIELD—First Unitarian Society (All Souls' Church): Rev. A. C. Nickerson, Ruth C. Nickerson, Kathleen Ryder.
RUTHERFORD—Unitarian Society of Rutherford (Church of Our Father): *Rev. Samuel C. Beane, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Henry G Bell.

NEW YORK.

BROOKLYN—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. John P. Forbes, Miss Emma C. Low, Isaac H. Cary.
Second Unitarian Society: *Rev. John W. Chadwick, Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Brickelmaier.
Unity Church: Rev. Daniel M. Wilson, Alonzo Chase, Miss F. Alma Visscher.
BUFFALO—Church of Our Father: Mr. and Mrs. George A. Ricker.
FLATBUSH—Fourth Unitarian Church of Brooklyn: *Rev. D. M. Wilson, *Cyril H. Burdett.
GOUVERNEUR—First Unitarian Church: Hon. G. S. Conger, *Mrs. Martha A. C. Conger.
ITHACA—First Unitarian Society: Clark S. Northrup.
NEWBURG—Church of Our Father: Rev. J. B. Green, Mrs. Hattie A. Marsh, Miss Gidley.
NEW BRIGHTON (Staten Island)—Church of the Redeemer: Rev. Hobart Clark, *Miss Elizabeth B. Curtis, *Miss E. M. Harris.
NEW YORK—Church of the Messiah: Rev. Messrs. *Robert Collyer and Minot J. Savage, D. D., William Loomis, Mrs. Alfred Robinson.
All Souls' Church: Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, Mr. and Mrs. George R. Bishop.
ROCHESTER—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. and Mrs. William C. Gannett, John H. Howe.
SCHENECTADY—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Fred J. Van Hoesen, Walter H. Clarke, M. Sheldon Lord, M.D.
SYRACUSE—The Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. S. R. Calthrop, D.D., *Mrs. C. S. Bigelow, *E. I. White.
TROY—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Richard H. Greaves, Mrs. Sarah A. Kenney, *George W. Wilbur.
YONKERS—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. Dr. James T. Bixby, Duncan Smith, *John Bellows.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI—First Congregational Church: Rev. George A. Thayer, Miss Fanny Field.
CLEVELAND—Unity Church: Rev. Minot Osgood Simons, *Mrs. James Storer, *Mrs. S. M. Strong.
MARIETTA—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. E. Alfred Coil, *W. S. Hancock, *Mrs. Laura Hancock. Alternate: Miss Muriel Palmer.

OREGON.

PORTLAND—First Unitarian Church: *Rev. Thomas L. Eliot, *Rev. William R. Lord, *R. F. Burrell. Alternate: Norman G. Pease.

PENNSYLVANIA.

ERIE—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Leon A. Harvey.
MEADVILLE—Independent Congregational Church: Rev. Earl M. Wilbur, Miss Martha S. Cullum, Mrs. Mary S. Cullum.
PHILADELPHIA—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Dr. James H. Ecob, Mrs. James H. Ecob, Mrs. R. H. Hart.
PHILADELPHIA—Unitarian Society of Germantown: Rev. Oscar B. Hawes, Miss E. I. H. Howell, *Miss Jane G. Mason.
Spring Garden Unitarian Church: Rev. Frederic A. Hinckley, *Miss Julia A. Myers, *Mrs. Mary H. Stockwell. Alternates: Mrs. Elizabeth C. Hinckley, *Mrs. Katherine M. Phillips.
PITTSBURG—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Luemma W. Mason, Mr. and Mrs. George O. Morgan.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE—First Congregational Church: Rev. Augustus M. Lord, William T. Crandell, *Miss Elizabeth Brown, Miss S. H. Cranston, Dr. Frederick N. Seabury, Charles W. Jenks.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON—Unitarian Church: Rev. Clifton M. Gray.

VERMONT.

BRATTLEBORO—Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. and Mrs. E. Q. S. Osgood, George A. Boyden.
BURLINGTON—First Congregational Society: Rev. Joel H. Metcalf, Mrs. Joel Gates, Mrs. Edward Wells.

MONTPELIER—Church of the Messiah: Rev. J. Edward Wright, A. D. Farwell, *J. E. Goodnough.
WINDSOR—All Souls' Church: *Rev. Clyde E. Ordway, *Mr. and *Mrs. Lyman F. Cabot.

WASHINGTON.

SPOKANE—First Unitarian Church: *Mrs. C. B. Dunning, *Miss Marie Dunning.

WISCONSIN.

MADISON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Frank A. Gilmore, Mrs. Margaret Allen.
MILWAUKEE—First Unitarian Society: *Rev. James C. Hodgins, Mrs. S. J. Schoonmaker, Miss Katherine Paine.

ASSOCIATIONS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION: Rev. Charles E. St. John, Francis P. Lincoln, Esq., Rev. John P. Forbes.
BENEVOLENT FRATERNITY OF CHURCHES IN THE CITY OF BOSTON: *Courtenay Guild, *Frederic H. Nazro, *Edward C. Bradlee.
BERRY STREET CONFERENCE: Rev. S. J. Barrows.
CAPE COD CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES: *Rev. Thomas Dawes, Rev. Albert H. Spence, Jr., Rev. Milton R. Kerr.
CHANNING CLUB (Boston): Charles F. Hall, president; Frederick W. Porter, secretary.
CHILDREN'S MISSION TO CHILDREN OF THE DESTITUTE (Boston, Mass.): Rev. Christopher R. Eliot, Henry Pickering, Mrs. Clara B. Beatley.
CHRISTIAN REGISTER ASSOCIATION: Rev. George Batchelor, *Chas. H. Burrage, Geo. H. Ellis.
CONNECTICUT VALLEY CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN, CONGREGATIONAL AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES: *Miss Alice L. Kennedy, *George A. Denison, *T. M. Shepard.
ESSEX CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN CHURCHES: *Rev. J. W. Hudson, *Rev. A. P. Putnam, D. D., *Rev. Eugene De Normandie.
MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL (Meadville, Pa.): Prof. Nicholas P. Gilman, Prof. Francis A. Christie.
MINISTERIAL UNION: Rev. George F. Pratt *Rev. William H. Savary, Rev. Henry F. Bond.
NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN WOMEN: Miss E. C. Low, Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, Mrs. R. H. Davis.
NEW YORK LEAGUE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN: *Mrs. Henry T. Wing, President; Mrs. Joseph P. Hale, Mrs. T. D. Robinson, Mrs. J. P. Forbes.
NORFOLK CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES: *Rev. William H. Savage, Mrs. E. A. Cushing.
NORTH MIDDLESEX CONGREGATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES: *Rev. George C. Wright, Hon. and Mrs. Harvey A. Whiting.
PLYMOUTH AND BAY ASSOCIATION: *Rev. Rush R. Shippen, Rev. Alfred R. Hussey.
SOUTHERN CONFERENCE: Rev. Geo. A. Thayer, Rev. Fred V. Hawley.
THE CHANNING CLUB (Boston): Charles F. Hall, President; *Frederick W. Porter, Secretary.
THE UNITARIAN CLUB (Philadelphia, Pa.): Mrs. Newlin Pierce, Miss Rebecca E. Haven, Rev. Frederic A. Hinckley.
THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S RELIGIOUS UNION: Percy A. Atherton, Miss Edith Melvin, Miss Rebecca D. Homer.
UNITARIAN CONFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND CANADA: *Adelbert Moot, Esq., Rev. D. W. Morehouse, *Howland Davis.
UNITARIAN CLUB (Boston): Francis H. Brown, William Howell Reed, Charles W. Birtwell.
UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY: Rev. Edward A. Horton, Richard C. Humphreys, *Mrs. Julian C. Jaynes.
UNITARIAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION (Boston): Mrs. Clara Bancroft Beatley, Richard C. Humphreys, *Dudley R. Child.
UNITARIAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY (Boston, Mass.): *Rev. Charles F. Dole, *Mrs. A[illegible]y C. Woude, Charles H. Stearns.
WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE: Rev. John W. Day, Rev. Albert Lazenby, Rev. M. O. Simons.
WORCESTER CONFERENCE OF CONGREGATIONAL (UNITARIAN) AND OTHER CHRISTIAN SOCIETIES: *Jonathan Smith, Esq., *Mrs. Jona. Smith, *Miss Anna M. Bancroft.
YOUNG PEOPLE'S RELIGIOUS UNION: Mr. Percy A. Atherton, Miss Edith Melvin, Miss Rebecca D. Homer.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

PREAMBLE.

The Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches was formed in the year 1865, with the purpose of strengthening the churches and societies which should unite in it for more and better work for the kingdom of God. These churches accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man.

The Conference recognizes the fact that its constituency is Congregational in tradition and polity. Therefore, it declares that nothing in this Constitution is to be construed as an authoritative test; and we cordially invite to our working fellowship any who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our spirit and our practical aims.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I. The churches and other organizations here represented unite themselves in a common body to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.

ART. II. This National Conference shall be composed of such delegates, elected once in two years, not exceeding three from any church or other affiliated organization, as may be invited by the Council, and accredited to it by a certificate of their appointment.

ART. III. The Conference shall meet biennially, at such time and place as it may designate at its successive biennial sessions, unless otherwise directed by the Council.

ART. IV. Its officers shall consist of a President; six Vice-Presidents; a general Secretary; a Treasurer; a Council of twelve, including the general Secretary and Treasurer, of whom not more than half shall be ministers; and a Committee on Fellowship, consisting of fifteen,—three from the Eastern States, three from the Middle States, three from the Southern States, three from the Central Western States, and three from the Pacific States,

—who shall be elected at each meeting to hold their offices for two years, or until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The Council, during the intervals of the biennial sessions, may fill vacancies in the board of government, and shall have charge of all business having reference to the interests of the Conference, and intrusted to it by that body, which is hereby declared a purely advisory one.

ART. VI. The National Conference, until further advised by its experience, adopts the existing organizations of the Unitarian body as the instruments of its activities, and confines itself to recommending to them such undertakings and methods as it judges to be in the heart of its constituency.

ART. VII. This Constitution may be amended, at any regular meeting of the Conference, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the delegates accredited thereto, provided public announcement of the proposed amendment has been given three months in advance.

BY-LAWS.

1. Three months at least before the time fixed by the National Conference for its biennial meeting, the Council shall issue a circular letter of call to the churches and organizations in its fellowship, accompanying it with a form of certificate, the production of which shall be the proof of membership of the Conference until others are elected, unless otherwise ordered by the Conference.

2. The General Secretary shall keep a full report of the proceedings of the body, which shall be published at the expense of the Conference, and a copy sent to every delegate.

3. The Council, at the conclusion of each Conference, shall issue an address to the churches and organizations in our body, whether members of this Conference or not, to be published with the proceedings of the Conference, containing such advice and encouragement as it may deem appropriate; but especially communicating to the churches and organizations the recommendations of the Conference in regard to plans and methods of work, the amount of money required for the uses of the year, the special objects to which they would advise its appropriation, with such suggestions, as to a just apportionment of the burden, as they may judge expedient and becoming.

4. The Council shall have for its duty to keep itself accurately informed of the plans and operations of the various organizations in our body, and of the state of the individual churches; inviting correspondence and soliciting reports, to be sent in one month before the biennial meeting, in which the general condition of the parish, its Sunday-school, charities, and general working may be set forth, to the end that the Conference may know what the wants and the wishes of the churches are, somewhat more particularly than it is possible to learn in the necessary hurry of the biennial meeting.

5. The General Secretary of the National Conference shall be the person to whom all letters and communications shall be addressed; and he shall be, *ex officio*, a member of the Council, and constitute its secretary.

6. The list of delegates, churches, and organizations represented in each Conference shall be part of the Biennial Report. The archives of the Conference shall be in the keeping of the General Secretary, subject to inspection and temporary possession by the Council.

7. A collection shall be taken up among the delegates at each Conference, to which any others may contribute, to defray the incidental expenses of the Conference,—such as printing the Report, etc.

8. Each church in this Conference is recommended to defray the expenses of its delegates.

9. All motions and resolutions, not merely of a formal or incidental character, which propose any action or declaration on the part of the Conference shall, unless the Conference shall otherwise specifically order, be referred without debate to the Committee on Business, whose duty it shall be to make seasonable reports thereon. In case any action by the Conference shall be recommended in a report, a suitable time for the same shall be therein designated; and, unless objection shall be made to any report, it shall be deemed approved by the Conference.

10. The Fellowship Committee shall include in its scope the extending of fellowship to ministers from other countries coming to America, and desiring to engage in ministerial work among our Unitarian churches.

11. No one admitted by the Fellowship Committee shall be entitled to claim insertion in the list of ministers until after being settled in some parish or other regular ministerial employment for at least one year.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FELLOWSHIP.

The Fellowship Committee elected by the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, under the provisions of its Constitution and By-Laws, and acting under the authority of instructions embodied in votes passed by the Conference and by the American Unitarian Association, has jurisdiction over the authorized list of Unitarian ministers published in the Year Book of the Denomination.

This Committee has power to cause the name of any person to be removed from the list, when it is satisfied that in conduct and character said person has become unworthy to continue to hold the office of a Christian minister in the Unitarian Fellowship; but in no case shall unfavorable action be taken till a minister has had full opportunity to be heard in the matter.

The Fellowship Committee also has power to add to the list of ministers the names of those who, coming into the Unitarian ministry otherwise than through the theological schools of the denomination, are in its judgment worthy to be thus enrolled. All churches are hereby warned of the serious danger they incur by settling a minister whose name does not appear in the authorized list, or who has not received the approval of the Fellowship Committee.

In deciding upon the fitness of a candidate for admission to the Unitarian Fellowship, the Committee will be guided above all by such proofs of the moral earnestness and integrity of the applicant as may be discovered under a careful investigation. It may also take into account the amount and kind of preparation that has been made for the work of the ministry, and may advise with the candidate as to any further course of study that he may seem to require. Should he take a special course at Cambridge or at Meadville, the certificate of the Faculty of either of those schools that he is qualified to preach will be received by the Committee, and will entitle him to have his name placed upon the list of ministers. In all cases, however, the Committee may at its discretion, refuse to put the name of a student or candidate upon the

list before he has been regularly settled over a Unitarian church.

Applicants for recognition as Unitarian ministers are requested to make known their desire to the Chairman of the sub-committee having jurisdiction over the territory in which they reside. Each sub-committee, after thorough investigation, shall report its decision, together with all material facts in the case, to the Secretary of the General Committee, who shall at once notify all the other sub-commitees of the action that has been taken.

Unless within thirty days after the mailing of such notice, objection to the finding of the sub-committee having original jurisdiction over the case is filed with the Secretary of the General Committee, the action of the sub-committee shall be regarded as approved by the General Committee, and, in case of the acceptance of an applicant, publication of that fact shall immediately thereafter be made in one or more of the denominational papers, over the names of the Chairman and Secretary of the General Committee.